SATYAM EVA JAYATE

WITH THE COMPLIMENTS
OF THE AUTHOR

SATYAM EVA JAYATE

A COLLECTION OF ARTICLES CONTRIBUTED TO SWARAJYA AND OTHER JOURNALS FROM 1956 TO 1961

(in two volumes)

By

C. RAJAGOPALACHARI

VOLUME I

BHARATHAN PUBLICATIONS

KALKI BUILDINGS — KILPAUK, MADRAS-10

Printed by R. Ananthanarayanan
for Bharathan Publications Private Ltd.
at the Kalki Press, Kilpauk, Madras-10

DEDICATED to the memory of Khasa Subba Rau who throughout life was "always in a storm of revolt and indignation against wrong, craft, tyranny," who by his warm approval and loving encouragement was the inspiring source of most if not all that is reprinted here and who had desired to see this collection made.

PREFACE

THIS bundle of weekly outpourings of sincere feeling during the period 1956 to 1961 collected together may very likely bore the ordinary reader. But it is not intended for reading from beginning to end. I would advise the reader to dip into either of the two volumes at random and go on for a page or two until he goes to sleep.

As for the few readers and critics who may read from beginning to end, it is true there is in these two volumes a lot of repetition. When writing these articles I did not imagine someone would bind these pieces into a book. I wrote from time to time as I felt. They are protests against errors—strongly felt protests against great errors. When one feels deeply, one repeats, and uses pungent words. I have written truthfully, that is to say, as I have felt. The reader may open and read the book by fits and starts even as I wrote the pieces that have been now strung together.

My protest against nuclear weapons and tests have appeared more comprehensively in another book, published by the National Book Trust of India under the title *The Voice of the Uninvolved.*

I understand doctors are coming round to my view about B.C.G., viz., that this is not a reliable and scientific thing, that the hopes raised on it can never be fulfilled and that it is not worth the tax-payers' money spent on it.

As for substituting Hindi for English, what I have said is my own personal conviction and it is very strong. I shall not press it on the Swatantra Party unless and until people see the wisdom of it themselves, unaided by anything like pressure, and without reference to political parties.

Most of the pages in these two volumes, the reader will find, are devoted to the movement of freedom to which the Sanskrit name *swatantra* has been given, which is a revolt against the policy of increasing regimentation to which the Congress Party which now rules India has pledged itself. The revolt is against regimentation and against the Statism which must necessarily accompany that attempt at increasing regimentation and its culmination, totalitarianism. The party that is pursuing this course is in power and using all the opportunities which administrative and legislative power gives to a political party which wields State authority over the industrial and business life of citizens. This will end in our undeveloped country in the extinction or a mockery of the democracy which we promised to ourselves in 1950, and in the wiping out of all the guarantees of freedom inscribed in the Constitution. The protests and appeals contained in these pages are made against a powerful party entrenched in authority; but utter faith in truth lies behind the protest. Hence the title *Satyam Eva Jayate* for the collection.

The idea of this compilation was conceived by my friend Sri T. Sadasivam and I am deeply grateful to him for arranging to get this book out so quickly and neatly through Bharathan Publications. As for Sri M. P. Sarangapani who worked with admirable devotion and energy to make this compilation and see the pages through the press, my appreciation and gratitude cannot find adequate words. His has been a labour of love and conviction.

At the end of the second volume it is planned to have a comprehensive index, the preparation of which has been kindly undertaken by Sri S. A. Govindarajan. The work he has undertaken is strenuous but he will have the satisfaction of feeling that this book has been made doubly useful and readable as a result of his labour.

C. RAJAGOPALACHARI

VALUE OF FRANK CRITICISM

"I am a sort of gadfly," said Socrates in his defence before the Athenian people. "The State is a great and noble steed who is tardy in his motions owing to his very size, and requires to be stirred into life. I am that gadfly which God has attached to the State, and all day long and in all places am always fastening upon you, arousing and persuading and reproaching you. You will not easily find another like me, and therefore I would advise you to spare me." Athenian democracy condemned Socrates to death but his words carried a truth that is immortal.

Great governments benefit by criticism, without which they are bound to deteriorate in self-complacency and unchecked self-will.

After Independence, patriotism and public co-operation in India have swung to the other end of the arc, and the Indian press has gone all out for praise and admiration leaving the Prime Minister of India in a dangerous state of loneliness, for unqualified adulation day in and day out is loneliness. The Oppositions in the assemblies either in Delhi or in the States are weak and divided into separate, small, self-interested groups and make no impression whatsoever either on government or on public opinion outside. The daily press which at present flourishes, in a business sense, is daily chiming concord and approval and in all doubtful cases waits to form an opinion until the Prime Minister indicates his own, and contributes but little or nothing by way of criticism.

The need is great for a gadfly weekly-paper, which is not over-weighted by finance and the consequent fear of losing money, which can close down any time and start again any day without serious loss, and which is governed by a sense of truth and public welfare and does not look to mass popularity or votes or the power derived from pleasing people. But to be a gadfly of the

Socrates-pattern, one must have in some degree the qualities of Socrates, regard for truth, purity of motive, and utter obedience to the voice of God within one's heart. We may not all attain Socrates's level in these respects, but we may all try to be on that road.

Everyone conversant with public affairs and who is older than sixty knows what powerful and healthy influence the very poor newspapers of the old days, with a paying circulation that rarely reached 10,000, wielded in those days. Papers now printing a lakh and proudly asking for advertisements on that basis carry far less influence than those old daily newspapers. They have almost lost the habit of adverse criticism either of government or of their small ineffective adversaries.

For years past Khasa Subba Rau has been no political or journalistic friend of mine except occasionally when it pleased him! But I believe his talent for criticism is a public asset. I am glad to give his new weekly the blessing he asks me for; and I give it with all my heart, for I know the great value of frank and quick criticism for which he has great aptitude. He has more than thirty years of journalistic experience and has now reached ripeness of knowledge and an understanding of true values.

News may be served by the daily press, but a good high class weekly has the privilege of educating the public in thought and appraisement, which I fear the daily press is not adequately or at all doing.

Democracy to be good government requires statesmen who educate and guide the people and are not merely politicians occupied in conserving their popularity for future power. Without guidance, adult suffrage and democracy based thereon will confirm the worst fears of those Indians who opposed the movement for Independence and allied themselves with the British during the struggle. The press too should not only aim at reflecting and forecasting public opinion but should try to

educate and give guidance to the reading public. The rotary machine has come and with it the doubtful blessing of large capital. The independence of the press has been adversely affected by this revolution in the Indian press. The small well-conducted high-quality weekly can supply a felt want and render great national service.

July 14, 1956 *Swarajya*

NATIONAL AND OFFICIAL

I have expressed myself frankly and publicly on the question of the 'official' language for all India. It is unnecessary to repeat my views on that question here.

Some people think that my objection to making Hindi the 'official' language of India is contrary to the views I held and 'enforced' when I was in charge of the Madras Government in 1937. This erroneous impression vitiates the criticism and the approval of both pro- and anti-Hindi protagonists.

Let me make it clear that even now I am, as before I was, for Hindi being made an important part of the students' curriculum all over India. It is the language of a very large section of the people of India, of the majority, if we disregard small dialectal variations. It is indeed in a position to claim to be the 'national' language of India, even as Hinduism is the 'national' religion of India. Just as people belonging to all the various faiths prevalent in India ought to understand Hinduism and learn to respect it, if they wish to be good citizens of the motherland, the people speaking the various tongues prevalent in India ought to understand and respect Hindi, it being the language of the vast majority. But it would be improper to make Hinduism the 'official' religion of India as it would,

according to me, be improper to make Hindi the 'official language of India.

'National' goes with factual majority but 'official' in true democracy as distinguished from totalitarianism should not go with numerical majorities but with even-handed justice to all, to the smaller as well as to the bigger States and communities. What is 'national' need not always be 'official'. Deepavali is a 'national' festival, but it is not an 'official' festival, although we may grant a number of holidays to suit all sections.

While I strongly protest against making Hindi the official language of India, I equally strongly recommend the inclusion of it in the school curriculum everywhere. English is compulsory in many European States on account of its importance. So also must Hindi be studied by people of all parts of India on account of its importance. All education is directed towards making the boys and girls good and complete citizens and in India, therefore, Hindi must be part of everybody's education. But this does not mean that the great injustice should be perpetrated of imposing Hindi as official language of the administration of India.

People may support this unjust proposal without fully realising its consequences. But the clear-sighted can see what great injustice *and unconscionable waste* it would involve. It would be contrary to the basic principle of planning which is the *conservation of what we have* without being misled by false sentiment.

It is hoped that whatever the Language Commission may report, a just and wise decision will be taken that English should continue as the official medium for inter-State and Central affairs, and that the provisions of the Constitution dealing with the subject will be suitably amended. The past history of education in India cannot be ignored in shaping our future. We can build justly and firmly on the strong foundation of history, but if we ignore hard facts and follow the mirage of unthinking prejudice,

we shall come to grief. The best form of patriotism now is clear thinking, hard work and unselfish service, not running away with sentiment, ignoring the consequences of our acts on millions of people.

August 4, 1956 *Swarajya*

FIFTEENTH OF AUGUST

WE are celebrating one more fifteenth of August.

Not only did India attain Independence on that day, but she demonstrated and gave a gospel of power to the whole world. The movement that culminated in victory on August 15, 1947 demonstrated to the world that one nation cannot govern another nation for any length of time except when the latter willingly agrees to be so governed or as long as it submits to it under a hypnotic spell. Once the consent is withdrawn the mechanism of foreign rule must break down. This demonstration is a contribution that India has made to the cause of world peace.

August 15 is therefore the anniversary not only of Indian Independence but of the revelation and demonstration of a gospel of freedom for all subject nations and an assurance for all who live in chronic dread of aggression.

Aggression is futile and everyone must now know it. The demonstration that India has made will enure for the benefit of all—to aggressors who may be saved by that knowledge from the futile waste of ambition to govern people against their will as well as to nations who, under a spell of needless fear, spend their resources in armed preparations for retaliation with weapons of mass destruction.

The choice is : Will you depend on retaliation as a power for deterring criminal ambitions and thus maintain an unending cold war eating into the vitals of the nations? Or will you depend on the inherent power demonstrated by India to nullify all such ambitions?

August fifteenth is a day that has disclosed a mighty force for disarmament that is inherent in the human spirit.

Let us celebrate the day in such world-meaning and not in a spirit of mere chauvinism.

August 11, 1956 *Swarajya*

AM I A PESSIMIST?

We have done our best and taken a great deal of trouble to break up our culture and we now take a great deal of trouble to search for culture and shout in glee when we find some traces of it here and there. We have acquired a common language and after laborious effort learnt to use it with ease and grace and precision; but now we resolve to give it up and learn a new language and imagine that pride can be a substitute for precision. We find a vast section of our people working honestly and diligently and with great skill making almost all the cloth we need. They asked for no capital and presented no housing problems. But we propose and actively assist to ruin their trade by organizing machines which will put these vast numbers of people out of employment. We appoint committees at the same time to invent and organize employment for everyone, for we are told it is dangerous to leave men idle and starving. We see that the need of the hour is a sense of true values and a sense of duty. We know that it is religion that gave both these in all countries

including our own; but we debar the practice of religion in the schools for the young and call their home-customs by the name of superstition. We want to develop reverence and awe but we debar the idea of an intelligent target and inspiration for such reverence and awe.

We want multi-lingual States but we break the multi-lingual States that we have, one which existed from before the time the British came and another that worked for a hundred and fifty years and did excellently; and after breaking them up we try to unite the pieces and try at fresh multi-lingual State-making. We find the pieces have broken their corners and refuse to fit into one another.

What a bundle of contradictions we have become! Who will now turn and twist us into some shape? May God help us!

August 25, 1956 *Swarajya*

BRINKMANSHIP AT SUEZ

THE London correspondent of *The New York Times* thinks that what the British really want is to oust Nasser whom they consider to be their prime enemy in the Middle East and possibly in all Asia and Africa. He wrote: "If Nasser refuses or tries to evade, Anglo-French forces might move in; initially they would occupy only the canal zone, but if Egyptian resistance led to seizure of Cairo and Alexandria and the ouster of Nasser the British would be overjoyed."

The policy of 'speaking from strength' has been carried from the field of cold war against communist nations to that of negotiation with Egypt. The object to be attained is that a

geographical advantage and economic resource that this small nation happens to possess, she should be deprived of for a dole to be fixed by the Powers. The Powers seek to wrest from Egypt the waterway that justly belongs to her under a scheme of development which a hundred years ago her then rulers had settled under the advice of a French engineer. "We are the users, so it must belong to us." "You are not a partisan of ours, so we cannot trust your management." These are the arguments advanced for the proposed expropriation besides, of course, a show of force.

As one of the world's foremost peace-mongering nations, to give a bad name for over-enthusiastically undertaking a good cause, India is most anxious that the dispute should be settled at any cost. Anyone who is very anxious to buy an article lays himself open to be compelled to pay a high price and to accept conditions which he would not normally consider just. Here is war threatened and with the prospect of nuclear weapons bursting over the whole world, nations that want peace are apt to be agreeable to terms which otherwise they would deem to be clearly unreasonable. We thus see that these 'weapons of deterrence' not only deter aggressive Powers, but have their powerful effect on neutral Powers also, who are not just neutral but are very anxious to maintain the world's peace. "We do not want war. If we insist on justice over this or that issue, the obstinate Powers are not likely to agree; we must give in here and give in there" — so will it be felt. Thus it will be seen that nuclear weapons deter nations from pressing for justice or carrying their idealism too far. 'Deterrent' weapons appear to compel unfair compromises besides restraining aggression.

The art of Brinkmanship expounded by Mr. Dulles has thus an application beyond what he made out in the remarkable exposition that attracted world criticism. It has found an extended use in the hands of his apt pupils,—to compel Egypt and her friends to agree to a transfer of the Suez canal to the Powers—for that is the real effect of the proposed internationali-

zation. The movements of British troops and the alerting of British bombers have created the required atmosphere for Brinkmanship manoeuvres. We can realise the anxiety of the peace-loving Indian delegate and his friends at the London Conference. Atomic energy in a sense plays its part in open waterways, as in industry !

It appears this new art of Brinkmanship has come to stay in diplomacy at all levels. It puts to test the boldness and skill of all parties in going as near to the edge as possible. Perhaps a defensive programme of Brinkmanship has also to be developed to meet this new tactic.

There is no hope for the world as long as these nuclear weapons are allowed to lie in wait. They are an enemy to justice as well as to peace. More important even than the canal is the opportunity that has come to 'cut Nasser down to size' for he has become in Britain's as in France's eye the key enemy in their relations with Arab people. The following extracts from a special article in *The New York Times* of August 12 will be founding illuminating :

> In a national television appearance Prime Minister Eden made it unmistakably clear that Nasser—not Egypt—is Britain's enemy. With the backing of France, which sees in Nasser the key instigator of its trouble in Algeria, Tunisia and Morocco, Britain is determined to "cut Nasser down to size."
>
> The canal dispute is grave but it may be doubted whether Britain would have reacted so violently had a more friendly Egyptian Government "nationalized" the canal. The waterway would have passed into Egyptian control in 1968 anyway, and Britain was not overtly perturbed about the situation until now. Now, however, the British are determined to be pushed around no more.
>
> The cost may be high—higher than anyone yet knows—but this trading nation does not trust Colonel Nasser.

If Colonel Nasser is brought to his senses, the British believe the peaceful trading world, of which all Britons dream, may be that much closer.

September 1, 1956 *Swarajya*

PHYSICIAN, HEAL THYSELF

"PANAMA Canal is America's property," says Mr. Dulles and does not mind the contradiction between that and his attitude over Egypt's Suez. Nor does he mind what the State of Panama has to say about it. The way in which Panama was set 'free' from the Columbian Republic of which it was a department and how America obtained all sovereign rights over the canal area from the newly set up Panama Government and the lightning sequence of these events are known to students of modern history. But America claims Panama for herself and contends also that it should not be treated as furnishing any parallel for the Suez business. All this is Power logic which we dull people in Asia find it hard to understand or follow. From the arguments naively advanced on behalf of the Western Powers over Suez, it is only a short step forward to claim all the oil wells of the Middle East with ancillary political control !

The propaganda against Nasser and the output of Suez literature from the Western bureaus of information continues. By the sheer weight of the written word they seek to overwhelm Egypt. "Gather together at once, all ye who are interested in world-trade, save yourself from ruin by ousting Nasser ! " cry the Western Powers.

But what has Nasser done? He has not stopped the least little bit of the navigation through Suez. On the other hand, the old company backed by the moral authority of both U.K. and

French Governments are seeking to organize or at least threaten a dislocation of the canal, thereby hoping to prove that the Government of Egypt cannot be trusted to manage it. We have had an experience of this sort of thing. All the I.C.S. men withdrew when India claimed the right to administer her affairs. "We cannot be in India after Britain withdraws," they declared, and in addition claimed and obtained heavy 'compensation'. Many of them have taken the money and are still employed on higher salaries than before in commercial firms functioning in the same India where they said they could not stay.

But the most funny part of this affair of Suez is that people who break the law in a far more deadly and terrible way arraign Egypt for the alleged breach of morality involved in the nationalization of an important high-dividend-yielding business. The Powers who continue to spread radio-active poison, damaging the health of the world in spite of universal protest, because they must do it to further their own wretched plans of 'security' through possession of improved means of mass destruction—it is these lawless Powers that raise this noise over Egypt's claiming what is her own territory and a canal business which she is desirous of managing herself instead of letting a European managing director to boss the show in Egyptian territory.

We feel that Goa should not be governed by Portugal when all India is free. Can we not understand Egypt's desire to free Suez from the foreign rule that is going on there under her very nose? If Atlantica is at war—cold or hot—with Russia, must the guided missiles carrying radio-active poison-shells fly over the heads of those who are not in the quarrel? Must we depend on the accurate marksmanship of mad people and the precision of their diabolic weapons and feel safe? Must we allow the seed of man to be damaged because America is afraid of Russia? Must we all wait because 'much damage has not as yet been found beyond doubt to be done'? We are told that the observed contamination of milk and vegetables all over the world is not

serious. Must the burden of quantitative proof rest on innocent peace-loving people? It is astonishing how dense our sensibilities have grown as the powerful nations of the world persist in wrong-doing. We continue to use moderate language when all international law is before our eyes being slaughtered on the altar of Western fear. It is time we cast off this illusion of inevitability respecting the nuclear crime indulged in by the Powers, be they of the West or East. It is time we tell the wrong-doers that they come to court with clean hands to arraign others.

September 8, 1956 *Swarajya*

COMMONSENSE *VS.* PRIDE

It is a matter for great satisfaction that after the Prime Minister gave a clear indication of his view about the value of English as a high class common medium of communication in India, leading newspapers of our country have also discovered the wisdom of maintaining this *de facto* common language of India and have expressed themselves in firm and unequivocal terms. It should not have been difficult to see the folly of throwing away the bird in the hand in the hope of catching what is hidden in the bush.

And we dare not even go near to the bush! That is to say, we dare not impose compulsory Hindi tuition in the schools. If for any political or party reasons, or reason of tact, in view of local political conditions or even all-India policy, the Government dare not impose the *study* of Hindi in schools, how can the same Government indulge in the idea of imposing Hindi as the official language for inter-State or Central purposes? The 'Central' is not a distant or thin affair. It is an octopus, though of a benignant variety, with its arms entering and holding almost

every branch of social and official activity everywhere in India. For example, the defacing stamps of even rural post offices in the South give the names of the places in Devanagari and sometimes in Devanagari alone.

If you dare not enforce Hindi for compulsory study where it is not understood or spoken, surely you dare not go a step ahead and impose it for official use. If a conquering hero dare not enter or go near the border he will not talk of ascending the metropolitan throne in the interior. If one has not the courage for the smaller enterprise, one should avoid the bigger adventure.

Apart from the logic of education before official imposition, let us look at the problem as a mere question of public economy. Why *should* we throw away what we have ? Do we not have English and hold it in free-hold possession ? Do we pay any tithe or tax on it to any foreigners ? Is it not a valuable asset ? Has it not a high, a very high foreign exchange value ? Surely English is much more valuable than the articles we seek to make and export to countries for earning foreign exchange.

There are great daily papers who wrote in axiomatic strain that Hindi must replace English for official purposes ; but dare they run themselves in Hindi ? They continue to thrive writing and advertising in standard English ! It is a first class comedy. It is a matter of satisfaction that now after Prime Minister Nehru has said it, these independent organs of opinion have begun to conform and express their present views in fairly firm language.

Let us drop the humour of the situation. Seriously speaking, it is best once for all for the Government consciously to drop this Tughlakian scheme of imposing Hindi as the one official language for India. Let us bridge the gulf between pride and commonsense by saying that English *and/or* Hindi, to adopt the secretariat neology meaning both or either, shall be the inter-State and Central official languages. Of course the

two media will go side by side, so that no State anywhere in the South or East may be inconvenienced and it may choose English if it prefers to do so.

Let the laws of nature work it out. Immediately without waiting for anyone, trade and business will take to Hindi more avidly than officials. Salesmanship demands it. Schools too will take it up whether the Government enforces it or not. May be in about sixty years, the diamond jubilee of integration may take place. Sixty years may be enough also for Hindi to forge a fairly understandable and precise vocabulary of handy terms of art and to develop a more concise style of writing and speaking, shedding its present genius for largiloquence, so that it may be qualified for scientific and juristic and other such uses where inaccuracy and ambiguity are dangerous. It may be said, "You do not know Hindi, your description is erroneous." I admit the charge of ignorance. But the ignorance is shared by crores of people here and is the very reason why I object to its being imposed on us as the medium of serious communication.

Even after sixty years when universal commerce and all-India trade may have brought about the integration between administration and commerce, even then some may ask why we should give up English. But commonsense and the law of nature will answer the question and not the fiat of steam-roller authority. Nature never goes wrong. It is only authority that is often guilty of undue haste and bias and mistakes power for proof.

September 15, 1956 *Swarajya*

AN ELEMENTAL NECESSITY

"Why can't I be good by myself, why do I want God Who has not demonstrated His existence to me? I am a member of

society and I know what I should do and what I should not do, I do not require to be terrorized into good conduct. And good conduct is all that is wanted, isn't it?"

Thus say many to themselves, especially the 'educated' people, those who have been brought up in decent families and are well and comfortable. Alas, they are wrong!

I would call their confidence an illusion of inheritance. The notion that God and Religion are superfluous and can be dispensed with is born of a state of mind that is itself the product of ages of God and Religion. We are apt to be unconscious of what we possess, thanks to our parents and to society. The sons of a wealthy father may imagine that poverty and unemployment are no problems, and that they are just vices and aberrations born of idleness. Similarly, we who have inherited certain habits of thought and moral feeling are apt to think that God is a superfluity that can be dispensed with. We do not remember that the decent social conduct of which we are so sure is itself the crystallized result of the faith and habit of ages. It is only a matter of time, and that too not very long, that what we are so sure of in respect of decent social conduct will wear out, as a tree dies when its roots are cut off. We shall be left with a problem far more difficult than what our forbears faced. The vicious urges of modern times are more manifold than those that disturbed our ancestors.

It is true that detachment and performance of duties without thought of personal gain automatically give a spiritual satisfaction much above what any personal gain can give. But what will lead you and me to detachment? What will sustain it on occasions of doubt and conflict? What will sustain equanimity and maintain loyalty to rules of decency and gentleness when one undeservedly meets with failure or with something worse?

Nothing but fixed faith and devotion to God can sustain us. Not without reason therefore did Tiruvalluvar say :

பற்றுக பற்றற்றான் பற்றினை அப்பற்றைப்
பற்றுக பற்று விடற்கு.

Hold fast to the Lord. Keep that supreme attachment intact so that you may be released from other attachments that bind the soul.

The same great truth was sung by Nammalwar almost in the same words :

அற்றது பற்றெனில், உற்றது வீடுயிர்
செற்றது மன்னுறில், அற்றிறை பற்றே.

If attachment has left, Salvation has been reached indeed. And if that detachment is to be fixed unalterably and attachment is to be wiped out completely, surrender yourself to the love of God.

विषया विनिवर्तन्ते निराहारस्य देहिनः ।
रसवर्जं रसोप्यस्य परं दृष्ट्वा निवर्तते ॥

Gita II 59

One can keep away from the things that give pleasure to the senses, but the longing remains. That too will disappear if your eyes turn upwards to God.

The *Gita* teaching running through the eighteen chapters is not a mere harmonization and compendium of varying schools of thought, but a single doctrine of worship. Bhakti alone, it says, can achieve that detachment which is true *sanyasa.* And so does it wind up with the great sloka :

सर्वधर्मान्परित्यज्य मामेकं शरणं व्रज ।
अहं त्वा सर्वपापेभ्यो मोक्षयिष्यामि मा शुचः ॥

Gita XVIII 66

You may have failed to perform all religious observances. You may have many sins to be accounted for. But come to Me Who am sole Refuge and I shall release you from every sin. Grieve not.

Let not what I have said lead one to the hasty conclusion that God is a utilitarian idea, utilitarian even in the best sense. God is a reality which even great modern physicists cannot and do not deny and which they approach without assertion of certitude but with the awe of enlightened thought. When we seek to know Him, we in our imperfect condition desire to know His form. But He is not like unto anything known which exists or anything that does not exist but which we figure to ourselves in our minds.

இல்லதும் உள்ளதும் அல்லது அவன் உரு
எல்லையில் அந்நலம் புல்கு பற்றற்றே.

Nammalwar

Love Him Whose form the like of which does not exist, either seen or conceived in thought. Infinite is that Good Entire. Embrace Him, ye men, giving up attachments that pull you down.

The worship of God is an elemental necessity of life as it has evolved in man and his mind. It is on a par with the urge for the preservation of life and urge for the maintenance of the race, like hunger and thirst and the urge of sex. It is a fundamental of existence and survival, not what can be questioned on the basis of use and utility. Man's survival calls for detachment and therefore for God.

The Vedanta Kesari (May)

LORD ACTON'S WARNING

The unfortunate attempt is being made in Ceylon that the language of the majority be made by law the language of the entire State. An equally unfortunate attempt was made in India, and still holds the field in spite of warning from the highest

authorities, that the land should be so cut up that a single language group can hold each parcel, and that such parcels should have all the paraphernalia of autonomous government — legislators, ministers, taxation powers, patronage, etc. The multi-lingual multi-nationality State is the ideal of political theory today. There is a return in political thought, after the experience of the last two world wars and the peace-treaties that followed, to the principles outlined by Lord Acton : "If we take the establishment of liberty for the realization of duties to be the end of civil liberty, we must conclude that those States are substantially the most perfect which include various distinct nationalities without oppressing them. Those in which no mixture of races has occurred are imperfect, and those in which its effects have disappeared are decrepit. A State which is incompetent to satisfy different races condemns itself; a State which labours to neutralize, to absorb or expel them, destroys its own vitality; a State which does not include them is destitute of the chief basis of self-government."

These are strong words. Very much before Lord Acton, King Stephen of Hungary had said : "A State with but one language and one way of life is both weak and decrepit."

Lord Acton referred to nationalities and races. Much greater would be the same conclusion against fissiparous demands on the basis of dialectal differences as between Tamil and Kannada or between Tamil and Malayalam, where there is no difference of race or nationality or even really of language as distinguished from dialect.

And in this connection it must be remembered there should be no notion that democratic rule by majority is a rule for the exclusive good of that majority. The good of all the groups within the State must be the continuous aim of majority rule, whoever be in power.

September 29, 1956 *Swarajya*

THE INDIAN CHRISTIAN AGITATION

THE criticism recently made of the methods employed for conversion from one religion to another has nothing to do with the rights and the duties of those citizens of India who belong to the Christian fold. Indian Christians are honoured no less because it is stated that outsiders employ wrong methods in their professional zeal to convert people to Christianity or employ themselves in doubtful activities other than religious. No one has the slightest intention to reduce the rights of worship of Indian Christians or their other rights.

I am not going into the question of whether the findings of the Niyogi Committee are correct. The Government will in due course examine the Report. I am only pointing out that Indian Christians need not misunderstand that the allegations against missionaries are allegations against them.

I believe, as every good Hindu should believe, that all religions and in particular Christianity should be respected and approached with reverence equal to what we give to our own religion. Our objections to conversion or attempts at conversion are based on that very article of faith. Mr. S. K. George of Trivandrum is a member of the Niyogi Committee. He also has been for long a believer in the doctrine of equal reverence for all religions and he holds that Christ's teaching has been misinterpreted in this respect. About the psychology of men who have recently adopted a new religion, what John Ruskin said in *Sesame and Lilies* may be remembered :

> Now there are two kinds of breath with which the flock may be filled—God's breath and man's. The breath of God is health and life and peace to them, as the air of heaven is to the flocks on the hills ; but man's breath—the word which *he* calls spiritual,—is disease and contagion, as the fog of the fen. The first and last and fatalest sign of it is that puffing up of your converted children,

> who teach their parents; your converted convicts who teach honest men; your converted dunces, who having lived in stupefaction half their lives, suddenly awakening to the fact of there being a God, fancy themselves therefore His peculiar people and messengers; your sectarians of every species, small and great, insofar as they think themselves exclusively in the right and others wrong; and pre-eminently in every sect, those who hold that men can be saved by thinking rightly instead of doing rightly, by word instead of act, and wish instead of work! — these are the true fog children-clouds, these, without water.

Ruskin's language is characteristically vigorous but his plea is for humility in all denominations, a plea which we had better all accept and follow.

October 1956 *The Vedanta Kesari*

SUEZ IN ST. PAUL'S

Delivering a sermon in St. Paul's Cathedral on Sunday, September 23, Canon L. J. Collins referred to the Suez canal issue and condemned the policy of his Government. "We might try," he said, "to buy peace in our time by use of force or by selfish use of economic power or by any other threat. But the hatred and frustration created by such a policy will bear in future generations a terrible harvest of despair and wrath. The revival of old-time imperialistic rattling of sabres may appear to some to be an effective method of dealing with people weaker than ourselves like Colonel Nasser, but it certainly is not the way of the Christ."

The way of Christ, the way of Buddha, the way of Socrates or of Gandhi were not taught to the peoples of the world for being kept apart from worldly affairs. Force and the selfish use of physical or economic power are bad in the moral sense when used against those who are meek or unable to resist. They

are not good even as policy in worldly matters. The moral law is not something aside of the policies of human co-existence. They run together ever in the same direction. It is true of everything that what is bad morality, according to the scriptures revered by nations, is also bad in the sense of worldly policy. This is so, because man's physical, social and moral evolution has been an organic process and necessarily therefore a single integrated development. The culture, the civilization, the morality, the religious spirit and all the accepted axioms of life are the results of one intertwined process of evolution. What the wise and good men of all nations preached, be they called saints or simply wise men, applies not merely to a pigeon-holed thing called religion. It is of undeniable validity in all spheres. If anyone disobeys the laws of morality, experience has shown that he leads himself to ruin in this world which has grown and shaped itself under inescapable law—as a crystal forms itself by laws of mathematics. Be they individuals or be they the group called society or nationality, all infringements of the moral law must be followed by permanent damage, whatever be the immediate illusion of advantage. This is what Canon Collins explained in his recent sermon by way of warning to the British people. We may hide the infringement by chauvinistic rhetoric but the law that governs cause and effect cannot be deceived by eloquence.

Any State, authoritarian or democratic, that uses its power for working out injustice to a weak section of the people or to a weaker nation abroad writes its own indelible fate of decline and fall. That is the moral law and it cannot be escaped. The saints saw what the politicians are unwilling or find it hard to see at once. The saints were informed by the spirit of God within their pure hearts; whereas the politicians and economists learn only by hard experience, by going through dishonour, defeat and depression.

Let us not condemn ourselves to the task of Sisiphus, rolling the stone up unendingly, letting it roll down again each time,

but let us accept the wisdom of our fathers and acting thereon build our progress and our happiness on a progressive upward plan. So taught Sri Krishna to Arjuna.

Not many problems arising out of human activities of modern times have been left uncovered in this old book of ours, the *Bhagavad Gita.* It would be at least as unwise for statesmen and rulers to ignore the moral law as it would be for a man who, working in a laboratory, ignores the recorded findings of the previous workers in science and seeks to learn everything for himself from the beginning by trial and error. Future historians will record their sad comment that in the year 1956, the governments of the West put back the clock of progress and goodwill among the nations. It will take long for the Middle East people to look upon the Western nations as friends and to feel secure in their company.

It is well that Canon Collins has spoken out. Fifteen years ago, the late Bishop Westcott, Metropolitan of India, spoke out in a similar strain during the last war about the incarceration of Gandhi. "If the Viceroy has his duties to perform, I too have my duties. The pledge to which I have been sworn when I was ordained bishop compels me," he said, "to advise and warn the temporal authority when it goes wrong, even if my advice be unpalatable." I am quoting from memory, for I heard him speak as chairman of a meeting that I was addressing. He warned Lord Linlithgow that his policy was wrong and opposed to the moral law. What happened subsequently is history.

October 6, 1956 *Swarajya*

LANGUAGE AND JUSTICE

Be wise, southerners, learn Hindi which will complete your fitness for Indian citizenship and enable you effectively to enjoy it.

Be just, Hindustanis, that you may be true to democracy and not merely exploit it by seeking to make what you possess the sole passport to full Indian citizenship and all its honours.

These are the two parts of my plea in regard to language. Wisdom and justice are both important, and they yield these twin lessons.

Nothing less than a thorough-going facility in the use of the national language will enable the people of the non-Hindi areas to take their full and proper share in the rights and privileges of national life. But until the time arrives when this can be said to have been achieved, it is not justice to forge a sanction against the non-Hindi people that consigns them to an inferior position or to give an undue and great advantage to a fortunately placed section of the people over all the others.

It must take time for the national language to become the one and only official language of the Centre. The Centre must be a just Centre and not be a lopsided Centre and an agent for injustice.

The language that served all the people equally hitherto must continue as an alternative medium.

It is not necessary to begin inflicting injustice in order to create an incentive for learning Hindi. The whole machinery of education is in the hands of Government and a policy can be enforced that will steadily and surely work towards the desired end without inflicting immediate injury or inequality during the intervening period.

Education should be the steady and just means of achievement and not the infliction of great injury on some sections and the conferring of undeserved advantage on one.

How long are we to wait is the question. Under no circumstance can impatience furnish a solution to great problems.

Our ardour for the national language must find vent not in injustice but in policies and directions of education.

Let us remember also the important truth that school and college are but a small part of the machinery of language education, although they may be very much more in the external picture than the home and the family.

If we examine the conditions under which English has spread and is spreading, we shall see how greatly the home was responsible for the accelerated pace of English. Each generation proficient in the use of English trained the next generation in the use of it.

The unbroken and subtle tuition of each generation is far more effective than what is obtaining in schools.

Only two or three generations of Hindi education can achieve that spread of Hindi which English has attained now. And this is necessary before it can be claimed that it would be just to make Hindi the sole Central official language.

Let me add finally that this interval of time would be necessary also for the real shaping of Hindi into a suitable official medium for all the purposes for which English now serves so precisely and so well. It is wishful thinking to believe that it is already as good as it need be.

Let there be insistence, but let us not add pain to the undoubted disadvantages that non-Hindi areas must suffer.

The Republic rests on consent and therefore on justice and love—not on sanctions based on authoritarianism or force. It would be too easy but not wise to depend on pains and penalties to achieve good ends. The slower is the surer and the better way.

October 27, 1956 *Swarajya*

WE MUST PART NOW

My appeal that at this juncture we must register India's disapproval of the British invasion and occupation of parts of Egypt by a notice of withdrawal from the Commonwealth has been treated as a natural and justifiable reaction by eminent and good friends in Britain but they deprecate action on the ground that we should not take the policy of the present Government of Sir Anthony Eden as representing the British people's mind. I admit that people of Britain—I believe, the greater number among them—disapproved of the action and are ashamed of their Government's doings. I admit that in Parliament the opposition to the Government's action was vehement and as much as five-twelfths of the total vote was against the Government. I admit that this British invasion of Egypt did not have the people behind it and from the point of view of British precedent in such matters the invasion was even an unconstitutional step.

But I fear that in political affairs nations must shape their action and their policies on the basis of what the concerned *Government* does and not be deflected from that course on the ground that the nation's mind was not reflected in the action of the Government. When a nation allows a group within it to sit in authority and use the nation's troops and armaments for achieving a particular end, we cannot ignore the act and shape our foreign policy on our own appraisement of public opinion in Britain. We pass no verdict on the people of Britain but we must take steps suitable to the situation created by the Government of that people. Otherwise we would be encouraging that very Government to go on pursuing its wrong course flouting its own Opposition and the condemnation of its own people.

Personal and even national friendships as such transcend politics. Our goodwill towards the British people may continue

despite our dissociation. Diplomatic relations will continue as before. The indifference and contempt with which we were treated by the Government of Great Britain in a matter of life and death cannot go without suitable reaction from us who had expected a different treatment. Opinions and policies apart, actual war cannot but snap a connection which is essentially a free association based on mutual goodwill and respect. A war on ourselves would of course end it automatically. But a war on a people with whom we are associated in positive bonds of goodwill and friendship must also affect the Westminster Statute tie, if moral obligations have any validity at all. India was treated to sneers by the Government and its parliamentary majority when the Opposition made a reference to India during the debate over this issue. Must we retain what remains as but an evil-smelling shell ?

It may be thought that, after the U.N. General Assembly's verdict against Britain, there is no issue outstanding and we may forget and forgive the crime. This view is totally wrong. As long as the British forces refuse to withdraw from the positions they have taken in Egypt, and the British Government is still pursuing its policy of dipossessing Egypt of the Suez zone, the issue is alive and very much alive. Anyone who has read the leading article in the London *Times* on the subject can see that Britain looks to the U.K. forces in Egypt to fulfil and complete the process started by the Eden Government. Anyone who has read M. Christian Pineau's statement to the Foreign Affairs Commission of the French Upper House can see how these aggressive nations interpret the present position. "Egyptian military prestige has been destroyed and it will be our duty," said Pineau, "to watch that it is not reconstituted." "It would be desirable," he insisted, "that the International Force occupy the whole canal between Ismalia and Suez to re-establish a system of international management of the canal." M. Pineau evidently thinks that the U.N. Force will function as just an auxiliary of the Anglo-French forces who have already done a good bit of the task which only awaits supplementing by the U.N. It is

morally impossible for India or any other country that feels for Egypt or generally desires international law and order, to play any part in a Commonwealth of which the senior partner, *viz.*, Britain plays this ugly part.

The present British Government claims that the strain put on the Commonwealth relation by the invasion of Egypt without consulting or taking into account the feelings of other members of the Commonwealth 'has eased'. Not a little of this new confidence is due to what they believe is the attitude of Mr. Jawaharlal Nehru. The Prime Minister of India is a careful person. He is far from being impetuous for which he has gained a reputation and it is well that it is so. But I am sure, as Clement Attlee hinted, that if Britain does not behave decently now, even Mr. Nehru may not stand it.

There is a great stake involved in this. It is a moral issue. The Government of India handed over Rs. 50 crores to Pakistan when the aggression on Kashmir was actually in motion and when the question was raised by important leaders whether the money should be given at that juncture. "We have promised it and it is their money and so it must be given," said Gandhiji and it was done. What a contrast to the action of the British Government who seized Egypt's money which was in British hands only as bankers, who claiming and enjoying free navigation through the canal paid no canal dues to Egypt after the nationalization, although taking their ships through ! And now, when America and Russia were otherwise preoccupied, British forces surprised an unsuspecting world by descending like Attila on Egypt when she was attacked on the other side by Israel.

After this aggressive pincer-strategy and air-bombing battle for grasping another nation's land which by their own international jurists stands condemned as illegal, how can we maintain a connection that was based on a common desire for world peace and for rectitude in international behaviour? It is wholly untenable and worthless.

Mr. Jawaharlal Nehru's statement in the Lok Sabha on 16th November cannot be improved upon. His clear, unambiguous exposition of the case leads but to one result, which result however the Prime Minister has withheld from those who heard him. I submit we must not falter. We must register our protest effectively by a notice of withdrawal from the Commonwealth. It would make it easier for those in Britain who seek to displace the present Government and a Prime Minister who no longer represent the British mind. If we do not do this, I fear what the London correspondent of *The Hindustan Times* has been foretelling will happen, *viz.*, the British people will be reconciled to the short-sighted policy of their present Government as after all more realistic than the idealism of the Labour Party. That is the way with the British people. God forbid that wickedness should thus triumph.

To U.K.'s stubborn disobedience and contempt of the U.N. mandatory resolutions to clear out of Egypt is now added the U.K. Government's rejection of an Opposition suggestion to put the Suez canal question before the World Court at the Hague. Neither the call for order nor the call for justice will be heard by the British Government. The British Prime Minister knows very well that Egypt would win hands down in any court of justice and so he rejects the proposal. He argues that the case is before the U.N.—himself refusing to obey the orders of the U.N. He had no faith in the U.N. and ordered his forces to land in Egypt and seize the canal zone. Now he thinks the U.N. can be trusted to complete the aggression.

Yet some saints of patience in our country, tireless of unreason and aggression, hold on to the view that we must stick to Britain. Why? Because there are still some good men in Britain outside government and we should not act in anger. Long contact with Britain has blurred our political sense. The bonds of ancient domination have taken deep root and put forth leaves of the colour of love and men fail to see the consequences of parasitic partnership with evil conduct. There are occasions when

sentiment must yield to wisdom, the wisdom of non-co-operation with wrong-doing. Our function is not merely to hand out oral verdicts on the conduct of various nations and governments of the world, on either side of the cold war but, first, to attend to our own duties both positive and negative. I claim our first duty now is to disclaim Britain for her continued aggression in Egypt and her defiance of the nations of the world. We should disclaim not by words but by cutting off a positive relationship that has become not merely unreal but an unhealthy source of corruption. I wish my friends could see in what light the British Government itself looks upon us now. If that were clearly seen there would be no two opinions on the question. We are imposing a companionship that is not wanted by the other party. It is not in anger that I say we should part. It is just wisdom, worldly wisdom even, to part when misbehaviour reaches an intolerable level.

November 24, 1956 *Swarajya*

ISA MANTRAS 6 AND 7

PANDIT Taarkikasimhacharya * was explaining to me the beauty of mantras 6 and 7 of the *Isavasya.*

यस्तु सर्वाणि भूतान्यात्मन्येवानुपश्यति ।
सर्वभूतेषु चात्मानं ततो न विजुगुप्सते ॥
यस्मिन् सर्वाणि भूतान्यात्मैवाभूद्विजानतः ।
तत्र को मोहः कः शोक एकत्वमनुपश्यतः ॥

"If a man sees other lives in himself and his own self in other beings," he explained, "how can he any longer fear others or have any aversion towards them? Surely he cannot."

"If others' souls and one's own self have become one and inseparable there can be no more grief or illusion because the

* An entirely fictitious name and has no reference to any real person.

one has become the All. There is no room for mutual feelings, of one individual towards another individual, when an identity has been established and there are no individuals but only one All."

"This is a correct inference," I pleaded. "But is there nothing more than argument in these two mantras?"

"It is a conclusive argument," he reiterated. "There can be no possible further question about it."

"I agree," I said. "But is there not something more, viz., a teaching, an instruction as to the way of life?"

"How? What do you mean? Sri Sankaracharya's comments on these mantras are most lucid and he explains how there is a clear and conclusive syllogism here. What further teaching is wanted? When all doubt is gone, where is room for more teaching?"

It is easy to understand the argument that when two beings become one there is no room for any further mutual action between them, because they are assumed to have no longer any separate existence.

But the Upanishad mantras show the way to *realize* the oneness. It is not easy to *become* one although the logical argument which is based on a hypothetical coalescence is easy to follow and cannot be controverted. Mantra 6 teaches compassion and sympathy and shows the hard but only way to avoid fear and aversion in this imperfect world full of desires and passions. Practising compassion and sympathy one will attain the stage when mantra 7 gets a meaning. "Behold!" the Rshi says, "as you progress in the practice of sympathy, you go nearer and nearer to the point when you will *lose yourself* in the souls of others, attaining full enlightenment. You will realize the Great Identity, and illusion and grief will disappear like a summer cloud or a dream."

This is the ethical and disciplinary content of mantras 6 and 7 of the *Isavasya.* These mantras hold a great deal else besides a syllogism, which by itself would be just a truism. Sri Krishna's first argument with Arjuna ended with the logical conclusion :

कं घातयति हन्ति कम् ।

(The dweller in these bodies being indestructible,) whom does one kill or cause to be killed ?

The *Gita* teaching does not stop there but proceeds to instruct how to make the logic into a realization. The *Isa* mantras 6 and 7 find their counterpart in the *Gita* (IV. 3, V. 7, VI. 29 and 32). When this realization is reached the Self attains the state described in the next mantra of *Isa,* स पर्यगात् etc., and in the *Gita* (V. 10, 28).

December 1956 *The Vedanta Kesari*

FOLK GENIUS

THE books of Moses, following the first five chapters of the Old Testament, are believed by scholars to have been reduced to writing long after the matter had been preserved only by oral tradition. The view prevails that although writing may have come into existence already, in the culture of the ancients writing was mostly used for practical purposes of commerce and living speech played a much more dominating role than writing in the handing down of such material as go to form these five books of the Old Testament—historical traditions, epics, cult legends and laws. In these fields 'oral tradition is primary and creative, written tradition is secondary and derivative'.

What has been said by Western scholars about the Pentateuch applies to the great Indian epics also. The material that has

taken shape in the *Ramayana* and the *Mahabharata* must have been transmitted only through oral tradition for many centuries before being reduced to writing. Centuries after the material had grown and accumulated the epics in the form in which we now have them came into being. This explains the *dharma-sankatams* or moral difficulties which the poets had to tackle. What folk genius had built up and had been transmitted through oral tradition could not be done away with by the poets. A poet who creates a plot could do anything with it, but here the 'plot' is already there with the people and neither Valmiki nor Vyasa could do more than make delicate variations and add explanations by way of debate or additional incidents. The killing of Vali, the fire-ordeal through which Sita goes and the story of Rama's renunciation that we find in the *Uttara Kanda*, the marriage of all five brothers to Draupadi as a single wife, many of the things done by Krishna and Yudhishtira, all these that call for explanation are instances in point. No poet, if he were free to make his own plot, would himself create such difficulties only to be tackling them with unsatisfactory explanations.

Folk genius has its own way and perhaps understands the mind of the people even better than poets whose main aim is instruction rather than depicting the truth. The creations of folk genius are not the less interesting for running counter to our present notions. Sita's case specially is striking in this respect.

The unjust trials to which she is condemned by Rama may offend all our ideas of justice. Yet the women of India will not give up the story. It holds in its sad features so much of what woman has to suffer in India. Sita's travails have an appeal to Indian womanhood that cannot be ignored as if they were inartistic defects in the *Ramayana*.

If a supreme illustration of the vanity of human wishes were wanted, we have it in the *Ramayana* where at the end of the great search and the fierce battle ending in complete victory for Rama,

Sita found herself free, only to be prized as a symbol of Kshatriya honour, and not as the beloved found again. Her long penance ended to hear Rama's chilling words : "I have destroyed the wrong-doer and freed you from duress and so my work is done. Not for you but for my honour did I all this." No wonder that Sita entered the fire for warmth ! This represents woman's life in India more truly than any artistically conceived modern story. Can there be any more impressive illustration for the vanity of all human wishes than this demonstration of the vanity of even Sita's love ?

December 1, 1956 *Swarajya*

AMERICA'S KURUKSHETRA

"*The battle of Kurukshetra is in the heart of man*"— Gandhi (quoted by Vincent Shean in his *Lead Kindly Light*).

READING the proceedings of the Canadian Parliament as reported in the papers, it seems that body is divided on the issue of the propriety of the British invasion of Egypt, exactly in the reverse of the position in the British Parliament. Mr. St. Laurent and his Government hold the British to be wrong and his Opposition holds the U.N. to be wrong, while in London Mr. Anthony Eden and his Government persist that it was profitable to Britain to seize the Suez zone and therefore it was right to seek to deprive Egypt of her territory, Mr. Gaitskell and the Labour Party striving on the other hand to play the moral role, so far with no appreciable success. British interests are always more real in the eye of the man in the British street than any moral law or the *Bible* texts. The Opposition in the Canadian Parliament wondered why a crowd of smaller nations dared to deal with questions concerning the vital interests of Big Powers. Mr. Louis

St. Laurent answered in terms that promise to become classic : " Because the era when the supermen of Europe could govern the whole world is coming to an end."

The Opposition leader in Canada accused the Government of following a course of gratuitous condemnation of the Anglo-French 'intervention' in Egypt. Mr. St. Laurent's apology was that the British action in Egypt shields and obscures Soviet crimes in Hungary. This was the offence, not so much that it was a breach of international law and a crime in itself.

Hungary might be the scene of great wrongs, but how can it have any relevancy in the judgment of British crime ? It seems the only yardstick for some people is how an act helps or hinders Russia. If it does not help Russia the act must be deemed innocent; if it helps to increase Russian influence it is a crime. A strange way of deciding right and wrong ! All the 'satellite' countries are victims of fear and force operated by the Big Power on their eastern border. But does that throw any light on the question whether Egypt should lose Suez to Britain ? It is strange that partisanship should be allowed to confuse such a simple issue. It seems as if the aim of world morality were only to secure parity between Western and Russian crime, not to secure good behaviour among the nations of the world, small and big.

America's conscience is struggling hard to do the right. But it is as difficult a task as was the Kurukshetra battle. " Enormous is this army of ours led by Bhishma, yet the army opposite led by Bhima seems also sufficient ! " so Duryodhana, racked by doubt and anxiety, said.

The fear of Russia gaining influence in the Middle East is the dominating motive that now seems to sway all American thought. The best market-solution for this moral conflict is that America should take over all the oil in the Middle East and enter into a firm price-pool agreement covering all Eastern and

Western oil. Then perhaps the Arab world would be left in peace. It may be worth while to barter oil for peace plus a fair monetary return. America can bring this about. Eisenhower's dilemma may be solved this way and Egypt saved from outrage.

On October 27, the U.S. Secretary of State (Mr. John Foster Dulles) spoke at a meeting in Texas listing 'Peace efforts, numbers one to six'. He called it the 'waging of Peace' by France, Great Britain and the United States. While Dulles was thus on his legs speaking, Mr. Anthony Eden at that moment was making his final arrangements for the attack on Egypt and the seventh Peace effort was launched on the first day of November on Port Said and we know what followed.

So far America has stood for right and frowned on wrong although it was Britain that did it. The trial of strength is between Law and NATO and the issue is doubtful.

December 8, 1956 *Swarajya*

THE BRITISH APOLOGY

The Foreign Secretary, Mr. Selwyn Lloyd, spoke brave words and spoke long before announcing in the British Parliament on December 3, that the British forces would clear out of Egypt in accordance with the resolution of the United Nations. He told the House why his Government acted as it did. The speech was of course far from convincing and it is no surprise that devastating irony flashed from the Opposition benches as the Minister gave one specious reason after another. The Government apology was vulnerable at every point. "The situation was deteriorating. It was one which sooner or later

was likely to lead to war. The only doubtful question was the scope or extent of that war. A general conflagration in the Middle East would have been disastrous for many countries, not least, our own." Such being the reasons, we are yet asked to believe that these sound public reasons incited the Government to start the war against Egypt without consulting or even informing the United States. One must suppose that this was out of consideration for Eisenhower's health ! "We have caused the United Nations to take action by the creation of an international force. We have alerted the whole world to a situation of great peril. There will be heavy costs to bear but they would have been far greater if our action had not been taken."

Well did Mr. Bevan point out that at this rate Hitler if he were alive might have justified his aggressions on the ground that by his action he brought the U.N. into being and indeed that that was his object all along. God grant that Britain under Tory rule may not also be in possession of hydrogen bombs. If Tory rule arguing thus and nuclear weapons went together, it would be disastrous for humanity. We should be glad that Mr. Eden had only bombers.

In spite of universal condemnation there is still the danger of British policy getting its objective. It will need extraordinary firmness and sustained moral sense to rule out the attempt to dictate terms for the future of Suez while still Egypt is kept out of her legitimate rights by either U.K. or French forces or the authority of the United Nations as now. In either event it would be a case of successful coercion, and what Britain had wanted. One might say then that Mr. Eden's aggression stood vindicated. In fact Mr. Selwyn Lloyd has already foreshadowed this conclusion in his speech. It is easy enough for the Afro-Asian group to drop into a minority in the U.N. and for a retro-active conspiracy shaping itself against an alleged U.S.S.R. offensive in the Middle East.

December 15, 1956 *Swarajya*

MONOTHEISM

THERE are some apologists who are anxious to defend Hinduism by making out that Hinduism is as monotheistic a religion as Islam or Christianity. They seek to establish this by suitable interpretations of Vedic verses.

I have no objection to this, as these interpretations are on the whole consistent with the philosophy of the Upanishads. But I do not see why we should take up an apologetic attitude in this connection or strain any text to the end stated. My confirmed feeling is that it is a fallacy to apply the theory of numbers to God.

According to our *Sastras*, the Supreme Power that supports and governs the Universe is an Entity of which we cannot define the form, size or number. We should remember that not only form and size, but number also is inapplicable. God is not only अप्रमेयः, God is also असंख्येयः. These are the two qualities that go together in the 27th *sloka* of the *Sahasranama* of Vishnu असंख्येयोऽप्रमेयात्मा etc., etc.

We mortals cannot premise form, or size or even number for God. It is impossible to say God is one or two or many, even as we cannot say that God is big or that God is small or that God is here or there, or now or then. Time, space and number cannot hold God. It is therefore illogical and unnecessary for us to go out of our way and try to monotheistize Hinduism.

Those who attribute anger and passion to God may zealously guard the oneness of the Supreme Being, but as far as we Hindus are concerned we are taught to accept that God is beyond the idea of number even as the Supreme Power is beyond the idea of size. God is as small as an atom. God is also immense, more immense than the Universe including the unseen immensities

figuring as mere bright points and nebulae in the visible sky, and at the same time, in Hinduism, God is smaller than an atom. God is one, God is two, God is three, God is many, God is infinite. Numbering is a process inapplicable to the Transcendent Power. If this be Hinduism, all talk of negative polytheism and all apologetic interpretations in favour of monotheism are unnecessary and illogical. The truth is that our religious philosophy is so advanced that it is far beyond the reach of religious ideas prevailing in other theologies and we would be committing a mistake if we attempt to conform to the latter. It is only for accommodating the Infinite Power to our limited understanding and our imperfect imagination that we contemplate that Power in various forms shaped in bronze or gold or stone or conceived in the mind, not that either form or colour or size or number can contain God. Knowing this, why should we strain to make Him one and single? It is as foolish as to strain the texts to make Him white or tall. We may revere all religions and their pious adherents, but we need not seek to lower the level to which our Seers took religion.

January 1957 *The Vedanta Kesari*

UNFORTUNATE MIDDLE EAST

British policy having miscarried, we are told by the West that there is now a moral as well as a military 'vacuum' in the Middle East. The West, like Nature, abhors a vacuum. Any rich area without some Western Power or other occupying it or dominating the spot is a vacuum according to Western notions. It is possible that Russia may commit aggression (says the West) and it must be prevented, that is, anticipated and countered. How? By marching in and posting U.S. forces there. What is the authority for this? Article 51, U.N. Charter. One hundred and eighty years ago, all talk in England was about a French invasion.

Samuel Johnson said one evening : "Alas ! alas ! how this unmeaning stuff spoils all my comfort in the conversation of friends. Will the people never have done with it; and shall I never have a sentence again without the French in it ? Oh, pray let us hear no more of it !" Substitute 'communists' for French and it reads aptly for the present American climate. The unfortunate Arab countries possess oil. Blessed are they that do not possess wealth.

There is an old folk story in the South. A low caste man, an untouchable, came to be the village servant. He said his name was Perumal (God). The village headman did not like to call the fellow 'God !' each time he wanted his services. So he said : "Please go, my dear man, and get yourself a new name." "Sir, I shall do so, but it costs a lot of money for the ceremony of renaming." "How much ?" A figure was named and the headman gladly gave it, for he hated to call this low caste fellow 'Perumal' every day. The man went with the money and returned after a week. "Well, have you been named afresh ?" "Yes, sir !" "What is it ?" "Peria Perumal, sir !" which means 'Big God'. So this was the result of the expensive ceremony. The British and French aggression has ended and the vacuum has to be now filled in by Peria Perumal.

(This article was received on January 5th and it is of interest that the Prime Minister expressed the same view-point subsequently at Indore.—Ed.)

January 12, 1957 *Swarajya*

THE EISENHOWER DOCTRINE

"In the name of truth, decency, and what still remains of civilized values," pleads Mr. Aneurin Bevan, "if we have to fight for oil, don't let us do it under the guise of protecting the holy places" :

Or,—let us add to this vigorous appeal—under the guise of protecting other people's rights to be un-converted to any doctrine of life other than our own halting and contradictory views !

It is curious how American statesmanship believes that doctrines of economics and administration can be made into concrete military targets. This view of international affairs is not very different from the notion that a sufficient supply of potatoes can make Shakespeare.

"History will show we were right," said Sir Anthony Eden when he was buffeted all round. Mr. Eisenhower is furnishing proofs for Sir Anthony's claim more quickly than any British Tory could have hoped for. Such being American policy, no wonder Mr. Macmillan has been asked to take charge. And no wonder he has said he will not advise a general election now and says he is sure to win when one is held. For the British people will find it hard to vote against Mr. Eisenhower's practical demonstration of Tory wisdom.

The net results of the Eisenhower 'doctrine' are an increased tempo of the cold war immediately, an indefinite postponement of the Russian thaw, an increase of anti-American feeling in Britain, the widening of the psychological gap between Asia and the West, demotion of Dag Hammarskjeold's prestige in the Middle East, a quick march to U.N. impotency and effectual nullification of any hopes of world disarmament. In every way the 1957 start of Mr. Eisenhower must be deemed most unfortunate for the world.

January 19, 1957 *Swarajya*

FOR WHOM SHALL I VOTE?

The Government's Five Year Plan is not going to be interfered with by the Parliament that will be formed as a result of the

elections now being held or by the executive government issuing out of that Parliament. Such interference is not even possible, even if it were constitutionally conceivable.

The only issue before any constituency in the present elections is therefore not any issue of policy but only this—is this candidate a trustworthy man of character? All other things said or written only serve to confuse the real issue. The only question before every voter is whether the man or woman asking for the vote is a person of reliable character. If he or she is a self-seeker, the person should be unhesitatingly rejected.

In my view it is very important that all voters should see this—that in this general election the issue is only character. The nation's work will be carried on well if we return men and women of character. It will be ruined if we return self-seeking persons or people of doubtful character.

We ought to realise that we are setting up a body of persons to whom we give the fullest authority to shape and control the life of the people. It is well known how large the scope of State authority now is and how greatly it enters into the daily lives of all the people, rich and poor. It is as serious as the choice of a doctor for a sick person or a nurse for a child.

All sorts of claims and boasts and libels hurled against one another according to conventional pattern will make the elections interesting. But the issue that greatly concerns us all is only what I have stated.

India has to constitute an assembly truly representative of her people, and truly worthy of exercising almost absolute authority over the lives of our people.

We want a body of men and women of unblemished character above all else. A certain amount of ruthlessness is called for to reject men of local influence whose character is not above board.

But voting is secret and right voting a holy duty. It is not difficult to judge about integrity and it is equally easy to refrain from supporting anyone of whose integrity one is not sure. The total choice of the people cannot but depend on the wisdom and courage of the individual voter who exercises his franchise in secret and by himself. One cannot and should not expect the total result to make up for one's own lapse, but must make his firm contribution in the right direction.

It may be argued that character may be a requisite for those who wield executive authority, but for a seat in Parliament or in a State legislature, representative capacity, that is, popularity in the concerned constituency is the qualification required, not character. What can dishonesty or unscrupulousness do in Parliament or local legislature? Indeed much can be done. Dishonesty and unscrupulousness can achieve most unexpected things to the detriment of national interests.

Over and above this general danger, there is the specific fact which experience has demonstrated that whatever the law or the Constitution may be, the local M.L.A. very effectively interferes in his own interest or more often in that of his friends in the administration using the prestige and power and the intimidatory sanction he wields over local officials. Our democracy is young. Our civil services have not developed the tempo of official dignity and independence to resist political pressure and to disregard the attempted intereference of the local member of the Assembly or Parliament where it is given not as advice in the public interest but sought to be employed in the private interests of particular individuals or groups or castes. It is still thought that the function of an M.P., or M.L.A., includes exercising authority over local officials. The personal character of M.Ps and M.L.As therefore becomes very important, even more important than debating skill and general party-loyalty or anti-British fervour. The last is mentioned in this connection, for it has still not ceased to be a popular measure of patriotism, however irrelevant in the present context of things.

Character is the main issue before the people in these elections, whatever the constituency and whoever the candidate. None of the leaders of the principal political parties in the field will be sorry if any of their candidates is defeated whose integrity or unselfishness of character is not accepted. Experience and punishment teach lessons which other means do not convey. Reverses in such cases are a blessing in disguise to the parties concerned and will go to release pressures which they now find themselves unable to cope with. It would be less than fair to Mr. Jawaharlal Nehru or Mr. Dhebar if anyone thinks that one must vote for a bad character if he is a Congress candidate. The same applies to the respected leaders of other parties.

January 26, 1957 *Swarajya*

EXPENSIVENESS OF ELECTIONS

The culture of democracy with adult franchise and direct elections has been adopted wholesale without due regard to the size of our population, our vast areas of space and the state of national enlightenment. Ambitious politicians find themselves at the mercy of parties and parties are at the mercy of financiers. A party in power has a certain advantage in the matter of collection of party funds, specially if the nation has allowed the government to exercise powers of nationalization and stiff regulation of all trade and industry. Other parties have to shift for themselves. The poor man has no chance to place his political talents at the disposal of the community.

This is a sad corollary of our attachment to Western democracy. But we cannot write back. Whatever changes we might have to make in the interest of progress and welfare must be made in the same direction as we have let ourselves proceed so far. The processes we have adopted for establishing free and representative government have resulted in power to

those who possess financial resources, be it individuals or parties. A sense of oppression, the opposite of freedom, has paradoxically seized men as a result of the flaw in the application of the mechanics of democracy. It has demonstrated the truth that what is meat for one country may be poison for another country.

The remedy lies in changing the mechanics. The expensiveness of elections is what stands in the way of what may be called free enterprise in politics. If we desire freedom to replace authoritarian dictatorship in the field of political ambitions, if we desire to release merit from the entanglement of party funds, we should examine how we can make elections much less expensive than they now are. Why should not a system like the decennial census operations replace the present polling booths as a means of periodically ascertaining men's minds? Why should not the State run the elections instead of parties and candidates? The total expenditure incurred at present on elections, if we take the sums spent by all the candidates and parties, is a monstrous, unproductive waste. Instead, if the Government could run an official non-party scheme of mobile units that go round in each constituency and collect ballot papers at each house as they collect census information once in ten years, the task of bringing voters to the booth—which in one way or another is the cause of all the expenditure now incurred by parties and individual candidates—would become a national function.

The details of this scheme of nationalizing elections could be filled in easily if we keep the main principle in view. The result would be the elimination of the bondage to finance that now plays such a large part in electioneering, with all its evil consequences. Of course this change in procedure would carry with it the elimination of all the attractive elements of political adventure including short term propaganda and 'education of the voters' through libel and slander. But this, instead of being a loss, may be a real gain. Everything has its defects as well as advantages. We must go by the totality of good and evil in

any alternative. The only way to get a reasonable and tolerably satisfactory application of democracy to India is to make vote collection an administrative function to be fulfilled in behalf of all parties and all candidates through the officials of the State.

January 26, 1957 *Swarajya*

THE KASHMIR QUESTION

THE one passion in America's generous heart these few weeks has been how to make up for the hurt she was forced to inflict on Britain over the Egypt affair. Britain is America's incomparable partner in the mechanism of security organized against the forces of darkness. This reaction of repentance forms no unimportant part of the psychology behind America's acceptance of the British resolution on Kashmir in the Security Council.

Up till date no reasonable explanation consistent with normal thinking has been found for Eden's strange action over Egypt, except of course mental aberration due to ill-health. The folly of Eden's adventure was great, but the present folly of the Security Council vote, inciting religious fanaticism and provoking territorial aggression in this part of Asia in order to please the Tory rulers of Britain, is not less foolish from the world point of view than the Eden adventure. The consequences—God forbid—can be dreadful, supplying the push that can thrust the world down the great precipice.

Plebiscites were conceived as a substitute for armed conflict. But the plebiscite in the Kashmir affair and, even before that, the resolution passed by the Security Council may lead to tribal intoxication and uncontrollable consequences leading to catastrophic disasters.

America may say to herself, 'Our weapons are not for aggression against India, but only for defence against attacks from the North.' This technicality cannot be sustained in practice. The earmarking of military aid is as profitless as earmarking the horns or claws or fangs of a dangerous animal, or the earmarking of money given to a prodigal. The sooner the Security Council's resolution is buried and forgotten, the better it will be for the world's peace. As an English journalist has written, Mr. Nehru's enemies up and down the world may be delighted at having triumphed over a man 'who had held so clear moral superiority over them so long'. This sort of shortsighted glee is of course a mark of smallness of mind and unfortunate decadence of spirit, but it is also a foreboding of calamity.

Reference is made by some critics of India to the manner in which Sheik Abdulla's Government came to an end. The functions of the Security Council do not cover such matters but are pre-eminently related to world peace. Many States in the world of today have passed from one government to another in odder ways than Kashmir and the Security Council does not propose to reopen those issues or claim jurisdiction to do so.

It is easy to put out a candle. We can relight it again as Othello soliloquized. But there are some lights that serve a world over which darkness has descended which, if put out, 'there is no Promethean heat that can the light relume'. No one can take Nehru's or India's place in the continuous battle for world peace. The power that Jawaharlal Nehru has been privileged to exercise in the international world is due to this very rareness of his position and the irreplaceability of his influence. If the West shortsightedly puts that power out of action, it is the West that greatly loses, not Jawaharlal Nehru. The sooner we consign to oblivion this Security Council resolution, the better for the East as well as the West.

February 9, 1957 *Swarajya*

THE *GITA* SYNTHESIS

WHAT is Maya? It may be defined to be the sense of separateness from the rest of the world that energises living beings, the Reality being the Oneness of the whole world, God who according to the *Gita* is

अविभक्तं च भूतेषु विभक्तमिव च स्थितम्.

> The Supreme Being is not divided into separate parts when He is seated in different beings. At the same time, He appears as if divided into so many separate beings.

To overcome this *maya* and to realise this Oneness with the Supreme All and to sustain the realization are difficult processes. Sri Krishna says to his pupil in Ch. XII of the *Gita* : "To realize and contemplate the Unmanifest Supreme Being is difficult. So offer your worship to Me who am the Supreme Being in human form. Surrender yourself entirely to Me. You may perhaps find even this difficult. But endeavour. Practice will enable you to do it."

"If you find this practice difficult," continues the Gitacharya, "carry on your daily life like others but do everything that you do in the thought that it is done by you for Me."

It was in this way that Brother Lawrence lived and worked as a cook serving the Fathers with whom he lived. He scrubbed and washed, bathed and dressed, talked and laughed and sang and slept, ever in the company of God as a beloved comrade. The grace of God was upon Brother Lawrence and he was enabled to do this. His work and daily life was one continual worship and yet outsiders saw nothing but the ordinary tasks of the day done by him as others did them. This sort of life is just what the Gitacharya teaches.

मदर्थमपि कर्माणि कुर्वन् सिद्धिमवाप्स्यसि·

Perform all your actions dedicating them to Me and you will attain the goal.

Then the *Gita* proceeds to give the central teaching : "If even this be found difficult by you, live and do as others do—but without caring for the personal fruits thereof."

This is the Synthesis of the Jnana, Bhakti and Asakti *margas* preached in the Hindu scripture. This Synthesis is well and succinctly explained in the 12th chapter of the *Gita*. Work done in the way taught therein becomes worship.

स्वे स्वे कर्मण्यभिरत: संसिद्धिं लभते नर: ।
यत: प्रवृत्तिर्भूतानां येन सर्वमिदं ततम् ।
स्वकर्मणा तमभ्यर्च्य सिद्धिं विन्दति मानव: ॥

(*Gita* XVIII 45, 46.)

By being intent on the fulfilment of one's own proper duty, a man attains the supreme goal.

From the Supreme Being have issued all these beings and by Him everything here in this world is pervaded. So if a man simply fulfils his own proper duty, that performance itself is worship of the Supreme Being and takes him to the supreme goal.

March, 1957 *The Vedanta Kesari*

U. S. ARMS AID TO PAKISTAN

The American Ambassador in Pakistan has no doubt statisfied the pure logicians of his country by his statement that if either Pakistan attacked India or India attacked Pakistan, his country would be on the side of the victim of the aggression, thus establishing the doctrine of parity plus arms aid. One may add

to Mr. Horace Hildreth's argument the fact that America offered arms aid to India also but the latter country of her own choice refused that help. But all this is nonsense to the realist and valueless in international affairs as we know them.

What is aggression and who is the aggressor are questions that can be debated in the columns of journals and in the U.N. Security Council and Assembly for months without end. There is, as we all know, India's complaint pending before the U.N. for the last ten years yet undecided. It has not been taken up and closed with a verdict even when Mr. Krishna Menon again asked for a decision this year in his herculean effort to expose the known to the unwilling to know. In October 1947 Pakistan attacked Kashmir. India, to whom the Government of Kashmir solemnly acceded according to the Indian Independence Act passed by the British Parliament, followed by the written consent of the then Governor-General of India in accordance with that statute of Parliament, lodged her appeal before the U.N. and demanded that Pakistan be named aggressor. But up till now no judgment has been given. The facts are clear but the verdict is not available. Thank God, Indian troops were able to overcome all the difficulties of the terrain, the climate, the surprise and the treachery, and stopped the aggression. Even now, neither the U.S. nor the U.N. display any intention of looking into the matter. This is obviously because Western Powers do not desire to further complicate their position in the Mid-East or lose Pakistan's friendship. They can afford to displease India up to a point, for India is not carried away by emotional currents as they fear Pakistan may be. India's reliable virtues are themselves a reason to ignore her feelings and she may be teased—which they dare not do to Pakistan.

There is not a shred of doubt as to Pakistan's aggression on Kashmir. Now, in view of the terrain and the obligations arising out of Kashmir's accession to India, India has declared that any attack on any part of Kashmir shall be deemed an attack on India. Military operations cannot be confined to any parti-

cular spot chosen by the enemy. Indian forces may have to deliver counter-attacks at such points as may be chosen by her own military advisers. What is aggression and what is a defensive counter-attack may well be an insoluble question when the judge is not overburdened with a conscience. Even where he is fully qualified to adjudge, it is not an easy issue to answer. If a bomb hits New York propelled from Moscow, the defence will not be just going into pits and caves round about New York, but must take the shape of a counter-blow on Stalingrad. But would the U.N. or U.S. consider Indian tactics and Indian strategy on the same lines as it may follow in respect of a complication in Western affairs? I fear it is too much to hope for this. Mr. Horace Hildreth's statement is an empty consolation. There is no doubt that American arms aid has got into Pakistan's head. It does not frighten India but it has greatly complicated the situation.

The fact is that Britain desires a revision of the partition of territory that was made in the parliamentary settlement of Indian sovereignty in 1947. The idea is that *apartheid* should prevail and that it is incompatible with British ideas of justice that any area where Muslims live should be included in India, although the government of that area may accede and although a Constituent Assembly of the people has confirmed the decision of the previous government and affirms its satisfaction with it by word, deed and orderly life. The American Government of course cannot afford to let Britain down and any recent friction or irritation between them is only an additional reason to behave in a more than ordinary friendly way.

One thing is however certain. India cannot let the U.N. or any other body revise the partition on the basis of which India is carrying on, or to overrule the lawful accession of any Indian State to India, or accept the doctrine that nothing can be finalised in the East without the overseeing authority of the West.

March 16, 1957 *Swarajya*

NEW DECIMAL COINAGE

When Mohamed Bin Tughlak of revered memory (peace be to his soul) saw the distress of the people consequent on his order to move the capital from Delhi to a more central spot, he withdrew his decree. The distress of the common folk consequent on the new coinage scheme of the Government of India seems however to make no impression on the present authorities in Delhi.

It is even now possible to rectify the error—of demanding a change at the bottom levels instead of quietly changing things at the top. If we wanted the decimal scheme to be adapted to our money denominations, we had only to issue a larger rupee, calling it by whatever name we like, giving it the value of 100 paisas instead of creating a new paisa of the value of one-hundredth of a rupee. If this had been done, there would have been no confusion or unearned profits or un-legislated taxation or undeserved loss to the rural seller or to the small purchaser, be it of milk or tea or a cinema ticket or a postage stamp or a newspaper. I need not multiply instances as distress letters are coming in for publication in the press. The bank accounts and the government books had only to apply the simple formula of 16/25 to convert all old rupee transactions into the new rupee. And the new rupee could have been called *shree* to denote the prosperity of new India or we could have lined up with the rest of Asia and called our new rupee by the name of 'Indian dollar'.

Even now it is not too late. We have only to print the new rupee notes—and gradually withdraw the old rupee notes—which would be automatically achieved in the course of a very short time. The fact that we have minted a large quantity of new small coins need not deter us from what I propose. These coins after all represent only labour. They could easily be melted down and reminted to produce coins of the denominations of 10

paisas, 20 paisas, 50 paisas, and any other denomination that may be required to suit the new system. These could run along with the old paisa coins without any difficulty. The labour of reminting is worth saving the distress that is ventilated now all over the country. All the old coins in circulation will continue to have the same value and purchasing power as before and there will be no room for any exploitation. There is nothing very sacred about next All Fools Day and things could be postponed to any reasonable date that may be necessary for the reversal of the scheme. It is a pity that I am repeating what I have more than once said before, but people can understand what I say more easily now, when things have taken shape in concrete form.

March 30, 1957 *Swarajya*

TRUTH ABOUT CIGARETTES

There is a ten billion dollar business in America devoted to make Americans buy more of the products that they don't really need. Likewise do advertising agencies in all other countries, including our own, who are all aiming at 'progress' and increased standards of living among those who can afford it. The function of advertising is to seduce people, to make them dissatisfied with their present way of life, to make them desire something more. "Advertising and its helpmate the instalment plan are the two most fearsome social inventions of man since the discovery of gunpowder," writes someone in an American magazine. Of course this is exaggeration, for we know there have been other and worse inventions since gunpowder which the writer has ignored. But his condemnation of advertising has a great deal of truth all the same. Among the ugliest advertisements disfiguring Madras, for instance, the cigarette publicity is perhaps one of the worst.

Medical authorities are puzzled by the alarming increase of cancer in Western countries during the last 50 years. Evidence is emerging that much of it may be traced to the food that is eaten. As a result of a symposium recently held in Rome attended by 52 cancer experts from 21 countries, it was announced that a number of food additives used in Western countries as dyes, thickeners, sweeteners, flavourings and preservatives were actually or potentially capable of producing cancer in people. The conference issued a warning that this menace to public health called for attention. In an article in *The New Leader* (America) from which I have quoted the above, an alarmingly large mass of facts are given which I shall not reproduce. But they all show that the best rule to follow is the Hindu Brahmin rule—which is now being increasingly disregarded by that very community—namely, not to eat anything that has not been cooked at home and served hot and to treat all sold food as taboo, tinned or untinned. The plain scientific fact appears to be that one cannot 'preserve' foodstuffs without adding what is poison in varying degrees.

If anyone expects the government scientific departments to help by investigation and publicity and official action, one would wait for the impossible. The Federal Food and Drug Act service in America (and we may not expect their opposite numbers in other countries to be more active or better equipped or better paid for their work) has, we are informed, "a 25-year backlog of research ! And new or relatively unknown synthetics are being added to canned, backed and packaged foods so rapidly that the prospect of testing them all is truly frightening." The safest course is, as stated, to avoid all food that is not cooked and served at once.

Writing about cancer, one naturally turns to the subject of cigarettes. Seeing the growing strength and unanimity of scientific opinion on the connection between cancer and cigarette-smoking, the manufacturers and others interested in the trade have started telling the habitual smoker through skilfully drafted

advertisements that it is quite safe to smoke 'filter-tipped' cigarettes. They play on the addict's well-known desire to justify his habit though he knows that it is harmful. They understand his eagerness to believe every fake testimonial or false medical claim that helps to anaesthetize his fears. According to the findings of the American Medical Association, "there is no evidence that the reduction of nicotine and tar by present-type filters has any physiological significance." Asked whether filters help, Dr. Alton Ochsner, the eminent cancer surgeon of New Orleans, answered : "Yes—to sell cigarettes ! " In appraising the protective value of filtration, there are two elements to be taken into account : the percentage of poison so eliminated and the quality of the tobacco used. About 40 per cent elimination may be a partial solution of the danger according to Dr. Wynder's article in *The British Medical Journal, provided that the tobacco selection cut or packing is not altered in such a way as to yield increasingly more tar.* Inferior tobaccos are being increasingly used in filter cigarettes so that they satisfy the addict's taste while pleasing him with a psychological salve about 'filtration'.

'Conclusive' proof may never come of the role exactly played by smoking in the spread of lung cancer. But enough is known for enlightened men to take action. If the benefit of the doubt is ever to be given to the cigarette trade and not to wisdom on the part of the people whose health is our concern, science will never be of help. Nothing can be 'conclusively' proved but nothing but good could come from cigarette abstinence. There are other ways of amusing oneself than by making our mouths a poison laboratory. Professor E. A. Graham, international cancer authority, believes that the evidence against cigarette-smoking is stronger than the proof that vaccination protects against small-pox. Vaccination-minded people may note this. Mr. Eisenhower's heart consultant has said : "Tobacco is a noxious weed and an unnecessary source of irritation to people's stomachs, lungs, blood pressure and cardiac rhythm." American admirers may note this.

Adult smokers may not care, but youth should be warned and save themselves from becoming addicted, without their realizing it, to what they may not later be able to give up. The best rule is the Brahmin rule not to go near alcohol or tobacco and eat only what is cooked at home and served hot. Get relaxation and enjoyment through honest physical play and mental interests, reading and listening. A great deal can be got that way which will build one up in body and mind and not lay a foundation for incurable ailments.

May 4, 1957 *Swarajya*

BRAVE AND GOOD PRAKASAM

If the love of one's people could make up for personal misery, Prakasam had more than enough compensation for all his private sufferings. Everyone knows what sort of difficult life Prakasam had to go through until death. His saintly wife left him long ago with two sons who did not make his life happy. But he bore it all like the brave and good man he was. I refer to this now, for my mind goes back to the day when the glad news was brought to me by Mr. S. Ramanathan that Prakasam was giving up his very large and lucrative practice at the bar to join us in Non-co-operation, boycotting courts, councils and colleges. This was in 1920. I could hardly believe it. But it was true. He was with me as a stalwart supporter in all the battles we had to fight for maintaining the boycott when Gandhiji was in prison. These were not easy battles, because the other side was led by powerful men like C. R. Das, Motilal Nehru, Vithalbhai Patel and S. Srinivasa Ayyangar. We had Vallabhbhai Patel with us and a majority of congressmen. But soon the drift began and congressmen on the whole were inclined to a compromise with those whose mind was set on entering the legislatures such as they were. Later, Motilal Nehru, disillusioned and sick, after

a gallant fight of many years, told me a few days before his death that there was no hope in that line and the legislatures must be given up. But this is irrelevant now. They were all various phases of a gallant struggle which finally ended in victory as all the world knows. We went through many imprisonments. Prakasam joined me when we took over the Government of Madras in 1937. He most magnanimously asked me to take up the premiership and worked as my colleague. Soon I found that his ideas of government and administration were not exactly mine, and we developed differences which however did not interfere with our friendship or co-operation until the war came and we resigned. He did not agree with me as to the solution of the deadlock by agreeing to partition. In this he commanded a wider support than did my proposal for a compromise with the Muslims. I saw that the British would remain for ever in control unless we yielded to the demand for some kind of partition and I continued to press for it till Gandhiji and Vallabhbhai Patel finally agreed also.

Prakasam had a combination of qualities that made for leadership and this was clear throughout his long and chequered career. His people treated him nobly through good days and bad and there is not a home today in Andhra that does not mourn for the disappearance of this great man.

Andhra has a great future and may God bless her with sound leadership for the constructive days before her.

June 1, 1957 *Swarajya*

NEW POLITICAL VALUES

It is time that someone should earnestly point out to the Congress as well as the Government that, after ten years of Independence, a great psychological change has taken place in

the public mind. Public feeling has taken a definitely new turn and even the minds of common folk have taken on this new phase which should lead to serious re-thinking on the part of those who are responsible for national affairs. The change is this. The people have revalued patriotism. They see that they cannot sacrifice the desire for good government at the altar of the history of Independence. The people now value good government as they value food, cloth and fuel. They want good government as they want the latter. It is no longer an atmosphere charged with nationalism and anti-Britishism as in the days of the struggle. It is now replaced by a fairly universal realization that self-government is not a substitute for good government and that a government run by our own people is not necessarily a better government than what one had under the bureaucracy which worked under the British Secretary of State for India.

The rich, the poor and the middle classes all feel that they want really good government as they want healthy food and durable cloth and good fuel. Good government is made up of justice and executive authority vested in efficient, diligent and honest men who do not work for political parties or groups but for the people as a whole. They want the government to be run by officials who do not become party tools. They do not want the public service to concern itself with helping the politicians to be returned to office once again.

It is not denied that some attention is given to good government. But it is no good giving that attention with an eye to the next elections or the nursing of particular constituencies. The motive for work in this as in other matters affects the quality of the work done.

The new phase in public opinion is marked by new political values, and it is fairly universal and noticeable at all levels. One cannot hope therefore to ride the same old horse and manage the battle. If the changed situation is not recognized and the ruling party drifts, with some makeshift arrangements for 'mass-

contacts', and if no alternative party comes into being, democracy will break down. At some stage the warmth of hero-worship is bound to cool down, and then some form of fascism is bound to come into play to satisfy the universal craving for good government. We must learn the lessons of history in the other backward and colonial areas of the world and save the situation before such a thing happens.

Any government can levy taxes and build roads, bridges, and irrigation works. We cannot hope to make the people believe that these are the gifts of the Congress. These things can be done by honest democratic governments as well as by any fascist government. The people cannot be expected to associate the Plan for all time with the Congress as a special favour obtained from it. They know now that the Plan is just a plan of expenditure of the taxes which the people pay. Plan publicity will not save democracy. It can succeed and it must fail in the same measure as America's attempt to win over Europe to her side by the Marshall Plan. The difference in favour of the American enterprise is that the Marshall Plan did not levy taxes on the people of Europe to cover the Plan expenditure. India's Plan is just a long term budget giving to the party in office an additional reason to continue in office.

If there is no prospect of a good and strong Opposition balancing the ruling party, the alternative is not to feel proud of the invincibility of the Congress but to devise measures for filling the gap by developing scope for free and open discussion and criticism, and by constructing a bridge between the party apparatus and the people. The Almighty Party Apparatus is sapping the strength of the people and that is fatal to democracy. Before party candidates are finally chosen the people must be consulted. It must be open to the constituency to set up other candidates from the party and compel the party apparatus to accept those who actually command greater approval among the people in the constituency. The party apparatus is apt to set up idols with clay feet depending for ever on the support of the party apparatus.

Had there been a well-balanced Opposition mechanism, there would be no need for preliminary appeal to the people in the choice of party candidates such as is indicated here. But as things are at present, the statutory election on the British model is not enough. The people must be given a hand in the choice of the Congress candidates themselves. The tyranny of the party apparatus will have to be cut across by a popular appeal. Group interests have hardened and they cannot be charmed away as when one appealed for unity during our struggle against foreign rule. Group interests have now to be taken for very hard realities. Pejorative adjectives cannot exorcise realities. The loudest acclamations are made by those who want other groups than their own to be defeated in their purpose while pursuing their own interest unintermittently. Firm justice as between them is expected of government in the social *milieu* with which we have to reconcile democracy in India.

Politicians continually absorbed in a hunt for popularity cannot afford to be just and to be indifferent to the relative strength of various groups, and a government composed of such politicians must inherit that shortcoming. Politicians must become statesmen and develop an indifference to career, if they can be trusted to run good governments in the difficult conditions of India. It is the same in politics as in private life. Detachment is at the root of efficiency and right conduct. Democracy is government of the people for the people, not government of the people by the party and for the party. Furthermore, party has gradually come to mean party apparatus, and it is unnecessary to point out that government of the people for the party apparatus is intolerable except for a brief period. Politics is a science of human affairs and not mere group strategy. Some politicians know no politics but party politics and these men will lead us to calamity by opposing every measure that may threaten the domination of the party apparatus, a domination which they believe is indispensable for maintaining one-party rule.

June 29, 1957 *Swarajya*

WEAKENING THE STATES

Ambitions to build national greatness for India have had always to fight the fissiparous tendencies that are inherent in our continental psychology. The centrifugal pull has always been a very strong and permanent feature of our culture and national life. Even the pressure of danger from a foreign enemy did not mitigate the *malaise*, but in fact led to overt or secret alliance with him on the part of some of the units. The explanation is this, and it can be appreciated by people who have suffered under heavy maladministration. Bitter memories of unjust rule made them prefer even an entirely foreign regime which promised to render some kind of justice.

Once, when returning from the Ajanta caves, I stopped at a village on the way where I was told the last remains of Emperor Aurangazeb were entombed. I entered the humble structure in which the Emperor's tomb was housed. As I saw the plain, small tomb, the Taj, Fatehpur-Sikri and the great mausoleum of Akbar flitted across the screen of my mind. In this tomb of Aurangazeb I saw more instruction than in all the glories of architecture that the other tombs and noble Moghul structures displayed. Frustration of hopes and vanities through inevitable law stared me in the face as if exhibited in solid form.

The rational Indian mind of modern times sways between desire and compromise, between the logic of unitary efficiency and a compromise with the hard realities of centrifugal forces. In some moods the one appeals and at other times one is forced to reconcile oneself to the other. Of course, different mentalities react differently to this perpetual problem. Again, apart from logic and appraisement of values, minorities in all regions tend to a preference for unitary government while communities in an impregnable local position of advantage prefer the small State and local autonomy.

Leaving history aside, even today in independent India we have not yet succeeded in stabilising conditions on account of this same ancient infirmity. It may be after all that the structure of national freedom in some countries must be federal and can never be unitary, and India may be one such country. The parts are not strong enough or isolated enough to be separate national governments. Neither are they coherent enough to make a single unitary State. There is no doubt an ineffable Indian unity, but it is not sufficiently solid for political building. The feeling for self-government itself becomes a force to oppose subordination to a larger democracy, where freedom must submit to be controlled by an all-India majority.

A federal form of national unity is not an unworthy status, if we could frankly recognize the goal and work for it. The dynamic elements that were engaged in the ambitions and political evolution of India in the past were personal, dynastic or oligarchic. Their ambitions could not content themselves with a federal goal. Every historic attempt at empire was to enforce total submission. Fissiparous forces always proved too strong in the end for such imperial ambitions. Break-ups followed each temporary success with accelerated speed. With the passing of politics from dynasties to the people, greater hopes may be entertained of a rational fusion on the basis of a true and equal federation of regional units. But unfortunately under the spell of democracy we are apt to fail to recognize the inherent difficulty of our continental culture. As a result we fail to perceive the real solution. We work for an impossible unitary political structure which no doubt would be more rational and lead to greater efficiency and strength, if only it were possible. This however is not the case. Success, however temptingly grand for sometime, will prove to be but temporary. The centrifugal pull that is inherent in Indian national life and culture renders it necessary for us to work for a federated union of equal autonomous units.

We must accept the inevitability of real federal crystallization as distinguished from monolithic patriotism. The Indian

Constitution that we framed did not fail to take note of this. But the history of Indian politics after 1947 has shown how the temptation has continuously worked towards centralization. Power is sought to be concentrated in the Centre and the States are slowly and steadily rendered unimportant.

There are some whose rational minds entertain the hope for an intensification of this very process until it should lead to a great efficient and strong unitary State. They may be pleased with the recent decision that the Centre alone will raise public loans for capital expenditure and that the States should be content with the small savings programmes. They may also welcome the tendency of the Centre gradually sucking up all taxation powers, practically leaving to the State governments only the work of local party management. (The difference between the affairs of the ruling party and the function of government is appreciated only in academic discussion.) We need not be surprised if proposals are soon made to convert land revenue into an excise duty on crops and to give over the sales tax completely to the Centre. The States are being reduced pretty rapidly to the status of grant-receiving corporations. This may appeal to some who are Centrally-minded, but it would be a house built on sand. It cannot last; for the time will arrive when the centrifugal forces will assert themselves and when it will be found there is not power enough in any personality at the Centre to hold the flying parts.

The wiser attitude is to recognize the permanent nature of the soil in which our political structure has to be fixed. The federal form of national unity should be recognized as inevitable for stability, and everything should be done in logical pursuance of that recognition. The wrong road will not take one to the goal, whatever be the high purpose with which we make the journey. Be it personal or dynastic ambition or be it a highly laudable national and democratic objective, the mistake in calculation must produce identical results in either case. Stability demands that in the application and further development of our

Constitution we should strengthen the States and keep the federal aim in view and avoid the error of seeking to weaken the units in the hope of making a strong Centre.

July 6, 1957 *Swarajya*

'CLEAN' BOMBS AND 'CLEAN' CIGARETTES

THE cigarette firms are very closely following the nuclear tactics. The cancer evidence that science has confirmed has become to the cigarette interests as great a headache from their point of view as the agitation against A and H bombs to the Nuclear Powers. Two hundred and fifty thousand pounds have been placed at the disposal of the medical experts for a change of opinion on the cigarette cancer issue. The firms are—it is now widely announced—and newspapers have large-type articles or may be cloaked advertisements on prominent pages—explaining how they are actively engaged in investigating, and will very soon succeed in the production of 'clean' cigarettes. It is to be seen which will come out first in the race, the 'clean' bomb or the 'clean' cigarette. The tobacco interests propose to 'kill' the cancer-producing cause in tobacco as if that were a bug to be caught and disposed of. The semantic jugglery of it is obvious, but smokers will accept any argument for continuing their addiction. They may even take a vaccine to enable them to smoke courageously. It is curious how the bomb-tactics are exactly copied by the cigarette men. The evidence of medical statistics, which finally found the cigarette guilty, is sought to be met by the argument 'that people who smoke may be those with a hereditary proneness to cancer as people of certain blood groups tend to get stomach cancer'. The cigarette interests want to make out that the cancer potential in the man somehow makes him take to smoking, maliciously to produce evidence to spite the industry, and that really it is not the smoking that causes the cancer but exactly the reverse is the case—it is the cancer that

produces smoking, and so cigarette must be acquitted, and the industry must thrive. "It is doubtful yet; so, go on smoking"—this is the lesson sought to be impressed, just as the Nuclear Powers want the world to believe that the radio-active quantum is not yet certain to injure, so they must be allowed to go on throwing the poison out until someone proves the certainty of biological and bone damage. Give us the benefit of the doubt, both the cigarette industry and the Nuclear Powers claim. "Do not make your doubts a reason to *avoid* the danger. Wait until you attain *certainty*. Meanwhile, we shall try our best with the help of such science-men as we can get to help us." This is the identical strategy of both the tobacco and the radio-active poisoners.

July 20, 1957 *Swarajya*

WE WANT TEACHERS OF MEN

Do we want teachers of men—Teachers in the largest sense, not schoolmasters—or do we want leaders of movements? My answer is, we want Teachers (with capital 'T').

What is the distinction between the two and why this juxtaposition? We wish to obtain an object—say the general improvement of individual character. We want men and women to be less selfish and more considerate about others; we want people to be honest and to value Truth and Goodness above money, and so on. If we wish this, and hope to achieve it in the short space of, say, one year, or two years, or what is worse, 'within my lifetime', there is to be a Leader and a 'movement which he leads. If, on the other hand, we wish and hope to achieve this by the method of slow indoctrination of true values and shaping behaviour and conduct accordingly, we can fix no time limit. The process is necessarily slow and we want Teachers who will teach and do their mission in a different way

from the Leader of a movement. They labour with faith and with patience and without ostentation or display. There is no question or room for 'my time' or for any egotistic hurry. A 'leader' has necessarily to strive to become known, to become famous, to be conspicuous. Otherwise the 'movement' cannot grow. This may be done crudely, or it may be done skilfully, in a restrained but effective way, but it has to be done.

This is not the way or the need in a Teacher's work. He, indeed, must want to be *inconspicuous.* He has to remain almost anonymous and work quietly. If he indulges in fame-seeking, his work, the process of magnetizing the souls of his pupils, will suffer. If he takes open or secret pleasure in becoming known and cultivates that science, he soon ceases to be a Teacher and either succeeds or fails, very probably the latter, in the role of 'leader'.

The Teacher does not strive for greatness. He strives for righteousness. The truly righteous man *must* remain unknown. In the *Talmud* there is a fine saying : "In each generation, the fate of the world depends upon thirty-six unknown righteous men."

Are there such Teachers ? Yes, sometimes God sends them out of His grace. Socrates was so sent; Jesus was so sent; Gautama Buddha was so sent. Ramakrishna was one such, as everybody now knows who reads what has been recorded by those who were taught by him. "Ramakrishna ! Thou should'st be living at this hour. India hath need of thee. She has forfeited her ancient dower of inward happiness. We are selfish men; O ! raise us up, return to us again; and give us manners, virtue, freedom, power." Thus we may cry out as Wordsworth did. And may our prayer be heard ! We want the unknown Teacher.

July 27, 1957 *Swarajya*

THE SECULAR STATE

It has been repeatedly affirmed that when the Indian Constitution laid down that India shall be a secular State, it was not intended that the State should discourage or be hostile towards religion, but that what was intended was impartiality towards all creeds and denominations. It was a refusal to accept the theory that different religions made different nations or that the State should belong to one religion more than another.

In a recent article in the American *Review of Politics*, an eminent writer has expounded at great length how although the United States of America is a 'secular' State as far as any one denomination is concerned, it is at the same time a 'religious commonwealth'. America, according to this writer, believes in the necessity of a truly religious basis of citizenship. According to the American Constitution, Congress cannot make any law 'establishing' any religion or prohibiting the free exercise of any religion. But the American Constitution presupposes a religious society. 'Secular' in the American language means 'non-sectarian', and not a negation of or indifference to religion.

The basic relationship between religious life and politics in America is not founded on a negative policy of non-encouragement. It is a positive policy of impartial encouragement of all religions and of all religious life and activity in American society.

The European concept of the 'secular' State is very different. It is a concept hostile to religion starting out of a feeling that religion is a political nuisance and that religious belief is a threat to political unity and stable government. The American concept of the 'secular' State, on the other hand, is grounded on a firm belief in the incomparable value of the religious life. The separation of the State and Church in America arose out of the desire to *protect* religion and not out of hostility or dislike. The

American people hold religion to be indispensable to the maintenance of republican institutions (Tocqueville). The framers of the American Constitution believed that the State can be free only if the people are basically a religious people.

Although there has been some misunderstanding in some quarters about it, it may be stated that the Indian conception of a 'secular' State is nearer to the American concept than to the European. The Constitution did not intend to discourage or undervalue the place of religion in society. It placed all denominations and creeds on a religious basis without reference to the strength of their following. It marked out a different path from what was chosen by Pakistan.

It is true that national integration is rendered more difficult by differences in creed or denomination. But national stability would be fully endangered if all religious faith should gradually disappear. Whatever the forms and rituals of different creeds and denominations, religion and the restraints it imposes on human behaviour are of inestimable value to society. What the Indian Constitution-makers aimed at was not a general indifference to religion but a tolerant and broadminded appreciation of all creeds and denominations and a respect for one another's religious beliefs and practices.

August 3, 1957 *Swarajya*

SALARIES OF MINISTERS

"Those who stayed on ended by believing that winning elections was the chief content of politics. History being more subtle, they ended up losing elections as well."

The above comment was made by someone about some other country and some other people. But it is an apt warning to

the intelligentsia of India and in particular to the Congress. Unless we put in more ethical content in our lives, political as well as social, the people of India will not be in love with us. They are simple folk but the fundamental shrewdness of good people helps them to discriminate. Window-dressed austerities have not much pull with them. The reduction of salaries or allowances by five or ten or even 15 per cent will make no impression on them. It will not lessen the people's burden of taxation or the distress caused by rising prices. The labourer is worthy of his hire, and it is unwise to reduce to danger point the salaries of men holding posts of great power. A Robert Clive will have to come to remove corruption and oppression. Salaries should be high enough to help withstand the inescapable temptations of power posts. Economy in such matters does not help finance and cannot deceive anybody. What the people want is not a sadistic impoverishment of those who exercise authority. That may be the desire of frustrated competitors in the same field. Political rivals may derive satisfaction, but it is not what the people want. They want taxation to be easier, and cost of living to be less burdensome.

The whole world, it is true, is now subjected to the malady of inflation. But in India, where even very poor men have a number of idle unemployed dependents to support, it has assumed a relatively intolerable pitch. Inflation has not only increased the price of essentials and therefore the cost of living at all grades of life; it has reduced the value of whatever little saving the middle classes had made for some insurance for old age. This is nothing but confiscation. A hundred rupees lent out or deposited somewhere or due from an insurance company or a provident fund is returned now, principal and interest together, amounting in real value to less than half of what had been thought was due. National welfare consists after all in the common man's domestic affairs. Unless this improves, there will not be that sense of peace and happiness which is welfare.

Progressive taxation is an emasculating deceiver. We must cut our coat according to our cloth. Let us remember in the

application of the maxim, the cloth is a living sentient thing, not dead or anaesthetized matter. Costly preparations for war are of no real use in the present condition of the world. It is just waste of valuable resources and a mortgaging of the future to foreign Powers. Military science is proceeding so fast that what preparations are made with great difficulty and cost this year will be of no use or consequence next year. Let us gather the courage of peace and righteousness and save our resources from being wasted on what is called defence and spend them for the improvement of the daily lives of our men and women which would be truer defence. Let us do this at least for a dozen years and then we may appraise conditions and adjust our policy.

We must instil integrity in public expenditure at all levels. It is deplorably absent now at all levels. It has almost reached the stage of callousness than which there can be nothing more fatal. Those who are employed to do government work should be paid satisfactorily, but they should deem it a shame to be careless or dishonest. It should be a shame not only to be *known* to be dishonest. Dishonesty must itself be felt as a great shame *in the act* and *before it is discovered.*

Unemployment should be tackled by real employment and not by a wasteful bloating of the services. Idleness has now come to be a natural incident of administrative life, where it would be true to say that if one man worked as he should, two others would have little to do. Such 'employment' is worse than unemployment. It would be better to pay a higher wage to officials who support unemployed and idle relatives and dependents at home than to run offices with idle hands doing less than a fair outturn of work but watching the clock all the afternoon.

The greatest waste is, however, in the management of large schemes and works. The care and economy that marked Indian officials' work in the old days are replaced by arrogant wasteful-

ness and culpable carelessness that have become a regular habit. What we want is economy and integrity and more conscientious work. The Central Government departments set the tone for the State departments and the government departments set the tone in industry. The essential part of the national Plan for the years before us lies in this task of economy and improvement of administrative morale. Otherwise the cost of everything achieved will be more than the value of the thing achieved, and cost means taxes and yet higher inflation.

But of pre-eminent importance is what has been already stated, a bold repudiation of the policy of competing in military investments with American-aided Pakistan. A greater reliance should be placed on the strength issuing out of a contented people whose welfare has been looked after than on the security that such military expenditure is imagined to give.

August 10, 1957 *Swarajya*

OUR DEMOCRACY

The successful working of parliamentary democracy depends on two factors; first, on a broad measure of agreement among all classes of citizens about the objectives of government; secondly, on the existence of a two-party system, in which each of the big political groups possesses effective and continuous leadership and is strong enough to take over the responsibilities of government when the majority of the country's voters wish it. If political opinion does not succeed in crystallizing into two fairly evenly balanced groups, the semblance of democracy may survive but real parliamentary democracy will not be there. When one party remains always in power, and dissent is dissipated among unorganized individuals and relatively insignificant groups which do not and cannot coalesce, government will inevitably become totalitarian.

A strong Opposition is essential for the health of democratic government. In a democracy based on universal suffrage, government of the majority without an effective Opposition is like driving a donkey on whose back you put the whole load in one bundle. The two-party system steadies movement by putting a fairly equal load into each pannier. In the human body also, two eyes and two ears aid a person to place the objects seen and heard. A single-party democracy soon loses its sense of proportion. It sees, but cannot place things in perspective or apprehend all sides of a question. This is the position in India today.

The domination by the Congress Party of the political scene is a product of history rather than of electoral success. Electoral successes are the result of this domination, not its cause. In order to justify the leadership that has resulted from history, the Congress Party has swung well to the Left. Left and history have operated cumulatively, and as a result the Right elements are depressed and disorganized, leaving the Congress Party in irremovable power. Irremovability, in fact, makes parliamentary democracy non-existent. In such circumstances it is inevitable that the party should become more important than Parliament. Differences of opinion may exhibit themselves within the party. If the discipline and authority of the party executive does not altogether choke 'self-criticism', a two-party pattern may develop within the party itself. The leader will take decisions in accordance with majority opinion in the party. This may be deemed to be a partial alleviation of totalitarianism, but even this may not happen if the leader be an overwhelming force by himself, in which case the party may not be able to divide itself even within closed doors. The mechanics of unadulterated dictatorship would then operate unhindered.

What is wanted to save parliamentary democracy is an Opposition that will operate not privately and behind the closed doors of the party meeting, but openly and through the electorate. Many people who would agree with this are divided as to the nature of the Opposition that is needed. Without inviting any

semantic controversy, let me briefly explain the mechanics of Left and Right. The Left consists of people who demand changes in order to bring about a speedy advance in the welfare of the people and more even distribution of it among all sections. Every change must necessarily produce dislocation, disturbances and distress corresponding to the friction and the jolts and creaks in a machine. But life, individual and collective, is different from a machine. The pain involved in change falls on living human beings, and must be taken into account in any orderly advance. A party on the Right, as it is called, gives expression to these distresses and disturbances, which are not less real or important than the need for change and progress.

Since, as I have said, the Congress Party has swung to the Left, what is wanted for the body politic is not an ultra or outer-Left, but a strong and articulate Right. The people of India, however docile they may ordinarily appear, are not just clay. Life, not being a mechanical system of forces but full of complex sentiments and feelings, the creaks and jolts caused by change are painful realities that have to be borne by living people in all grades of society, whose patterns of life are the product of long history. The distress is not dissipated into the stratosphere, but strikes at the living, sensitive nerves of men, women and children.

The pain of change is a simple-looking phrase that sums up all that follows from over-taxation, disemployment, high prices, exploitation by the newly-favoured classes and groups, unbalanced family budgets, and the hysteria resulting from all these things in themselves, and from the ordinary individual's sense of his own impotence in face of them. Those who suffer these impacts would welcome a parliamentary party that would compel attention to these creaks and jolts and disturbances in life, and which would meet the Left on level terms and, by testing and measuring both proposed legislation and day-to-day administration, would challenge the wisdom of the governing party and compel modification when those in power act in a way which would produce more pain than profit to the community. This is the

function of the Right, and there is a widespread demand for such a party. Those who are interested in the conservative aspect of progress should therefore exert themselves to build up such an Opposition.

The best elements in the governing party are quite aware of the quasi-totalitarianism implicit in the Congress Party's dominant position and of the need for a strong Opposition to make parliamentary democracy a reality. But it is not their business to do what is the proper task of those who feel the pain of Leftist change.

A particular ideology, or even a slogan without much precise meaning, may so seize men's minds that people may fail to organize themselves into an effective Opposition even though there may be a sizeable volume of opinion to support a contrary view. Although there is today abundant material for a powerful Opposition, hypnotic fear and the pressure of individual interests operate to prevent the gathering together of the forces. Day-to-day life cannot be carried on without appeals for favours of all kinds from the government in power, and any effort in the direction of forming an Opposition party must involve sacrifice and considerable risk on the part of those who would make such a venture. Sacrifice comes naturally with revolutions but conservative wisdom does not excite a similar emotion. Reason generates fear, and men of experience are inclined to political caution in the personal sense. Distress is accepted with fatalism, not with the spirit of sacrifice which is determined not to allow similar distresses to be inflicted on others. Unless the conservatives realize their duty, throw off their dejection, overcome their fears and unite to build a worthy Opposition, parliamentary democracy in India has a dismal future. Parties which are to the left of the Congress can never hope to function as more than prodding ginger-groups, since it is quite unrealistic for them to imagine themselves as alternatives to a government which is itself prepared to go as far to the left as it is possible to do and which has installed itself on the crest of historic success.

There is another factor that must be taken into account in India. The centrifugal force of regional interests cuts across all political issues. In a country of this size, with all the differing conditions prevailing in the various States, regional interests and issues arising from them in the effort to build welfare overshadow other matters. This creates an additional and great obstacle to two-party polarization in politics. Each regional interest is a solid reality, and this fact tends to impose on Parliament a chequered pattern which in Westminster is only faintly perceptible in Scottish and Welsh nationalism.

The solution for this problem is not to keep blowing scorn at regional feelings, but to concede greater autonomy to the States, so as to minimize regional thinking and eliminate the pressure of regional interests at the Centre, and to make the Centre an instrument for the broadest policies and not, as now, one for dealing with every tank bund, school, hospital and social service club. This statement about the Centre may seem exaggerated, but it is not. During the last few years the tendency to centralize has grown to proportions which are both ridiculous and alarming.

A 'Council of State' in a truer sense than what is now at Delhi is called for, wherein regional interests could be represented without reference to political parties, and whose powers should be other than those of a mere registering chamber. But the main remedy lies not in the remodelling of the Council of State, but in a much greater autonomy of the States themselves. The legislatures of the States and the administration of their governments should be run on the parliamentary model, while the Centre gradually crystallizes into a true federal authority. Federal powers, on issues other than foreign affairs and defence, should shrink to the barest minimum, while the powers exercised by the States should expand very greatly.

During the period of transition to greater regional autonomy, politics in the States may take a curious course. Conflict of opinion will naturally develop around the issue of division of

powers between the States and the Union. The Congress Party in all the States during this period is bound to be a Unionist or Centrist party, the Opposition being a party pledged to conserve and increase local autonomy. Until a balance is reached, centrists would try to create emotion around slogans of national unity, while provincialists would fight zealously for the interests of the region. These healthy struggles would cut across and minimize caste and sub-caste politics, which in itself would be a great gain for efficiency and integrity in administration. The growth of a vigorous localist party in each State, without distinctions arising from caste feeling, will save provincial governments from deterioration on account of unchecked power in the hands of a majority.

Whatever may be the political structure, the people want fair and impartial, as well as efficient administration. In an environment dominated by family and communal loyalties and attachments, parochial authority quickly causes deterioration among officials. All-round progress and the elimination of unhealthy practices would be largely secured if, while the States are given larger powers, the personnel of administration all over India—Federal as well as State—are kept under the strict and independent guardianship of an all-India body, consisting of very senior officials, whose concern would be to maintain professional quality in the various services, and to protect the officials against political pressures and victimization. This should not interfere with greater devolution of authority to the States. The professional aspect of administration is different from the execution of policy. The defence forces, the police, and the administrative services should be true to their own standards of efficiency and character and be above party politics. They should carry out government policies irrespective of whatever party may be in power. Their discipline must therefore be self-sustained. Efficiency, independence and integrity in officials are necessary both for Federal and State affairs, and the more the services are released from political pressure and temptations to discriminate unfairly on account of political or communal influences, the better it will be for all concerned; for government as well as Opposition, and

certainly for the people governed. An efficient administrative machine is absolutely necessary if democracy is to result in that general happiness which is our aim.

August 17, 1957 *Swarajya*

MAN NEEDS GOD

"ONCE the core of faith is lost, Satan must triumph and the forces of evil overwhelm mankind," wrote Jacob Sloan in a preface to a recent book of Isaac Singer. How true it is and how well and sadly demonstrated in our own body politic ! What can freedom achieve if there be no God in the hearts of men ?

We got freedom through the genius and the efforts of a man of God. He found a way to confound the then most powerful imperialist Power on earth and made it yield India her full freedom. Every moment of his life he depended on God. But after him, we who inherited freedom have found God troublesome and left Him un-recognized. As a result, we are in a morass of disunion, corruption, careerist individualism, greed and dishonesty which have made all laws and plans for progress nearly futile.

At the base, the rising structure of progress demands Faith in God. We cannot arrive at Him by enquiry and experiment or argumentation. For He is a mystery beyond sense-proof. Man needs God, although He cannot be got at through argument or enquiry even as he needs air though he cannot see it. What we need we must have, whatever be the difficulty of proof. The proof is in the need itself. No baby knows of what or how it was itself made or how a mother came to be, but it needs the mother and cleaves to her. No one can 'prove' the mother for the baby, yet there is no greater love or proof or nutrition than mother to

baby. Without Him we shall fail in individual as well as national life. Civilization is founded on him. If we reject Him, we shall reject civilization, for this rests not on 'material' progress but spiritual endeavour and self-control and honest co-operation, all of which depend on Faith in a Supreme Power. Let us get back to the path from which we have strayed and therefore find ourselves beset with all sorts of problems, difficulties and darkness. Let us no longer trust in the will-o'-the-wisp of material desires given the name of progress. Let us hold fast to the well-tried lamp of Faith and keep to the old road. The broken atom is not God. It will lead us to destruction. Science will help only if we keep in our hearts God, the mystery behind all Science, He that is smaller than the atom and bigger than the visible universe.

August 31, 1957 *Swarajya*

OPEN THE LID

Often it is difficult to unravel the meaning of a scripture text and have a full vision of the truth that is locked in it. Truth is held enclosed in a golden casket. It is earnest prayer alone that will cause the lid to open.

हिरण्मयेन पात्रेण सत्यस्यापिहितं मुखम् ।
तत्त्वं पूषन्नपावृणु सत्यधर्माय दृष्टये ॥

In a casket all gold
Is Truth kept and the lid closed :
O guider, open the lid of the casket
That Truth and Dharma be seen.

So prays the Rshi in the *Isavasya* Upanishad.

Thus may we also pray, whenever we are unable to see the truth encased in a mantra. The prayer will be heard. Not all the grammar that has been evolved later, not all the commentaries

of scholars will help us unless the longing for Grace and understanding is poured out in the form of prayer.

For instance, in the *maarjanam* that is daily done according to custom, as we sprinkle the prayer-laden water over our heads, we say :

यस्य क्षयाय जिन्वथ आपो जनयथा च नः

Often I prayed that the meaning of this ancient mantra may be disclosed and often have I consulted available commentaries ! My longing is yet to be satisfied. I have wondered sometimes whether it means :

'O you water that delight in losing yourself and disappearing, create in me too that delight in being lost in the whole ! '

Or does it mean : 'O water, you that sport in your wide abode so merrily in cloud and rain and stream, give me too that life of joy'?

The *Isopanishad* mantra I have quoted above has been interpreted usually in the light of the mantra following it as a prayer to the Sun : 'Withdraw your blinding rays that dazzle my mortal eyes. Show me your tempered and beautiful form'.

May be, poetry, philosophy and religion all three ran to join in one stream and produced this great invocation for enlightenment. Omar Khayyam (beautifully rendered by Fitzgerald) cried :

Myself when young did eagerly frequent
Doctor and Saint, and heard great argument
About it and about : but ever more
Came out by the same door as in I went.
There was a door to which I found no key.
There was a veil past which I could not see ;
Some little talk a while of Me and Thee
There seemed—and then no more of Thee and Me

THE FINANCE MINISTER

"IT is some evil genius that has brought division of labour in everything and to such extent as to strip each process of creativeness leaving it incapable of inspiration or interest." So said Maxim Gorky in his autobiography. As with productive crafts so with governments also. In the Government of India we find the Finance Minister is employed and interested only in raising money. He does not care what total spiritual damage his taxes are causing, what subversive shake his schemes of raising money are giving to the structure of patriotism. He is acting like a man who is dynamiting a well for water having undertaken that work, not caring what the explosions do to the house where those who wanted the water live. The labour of government is fatally divided. "You have planned and want money. So I tax." "But the tax is too much. It kills the goose that lays the taxes." "I do not care, my part of the work is all my concern," says the Finance Minister.

Buying books will not be taxed. Election expenditure will not be taxed. These are silencers to get the parliamentarians to keep quiet. Is it that we could get any bill through, provided we give the required concessions to ease the parliamentarians' lives? What about the lives of those who are not in Parliament and whom parliamentarians represent?

Is this tax a sumptuary law to penalise waste and frivolity? Then we could all co-operate to shape it to that end. But it is not a sumptuary law. It is to raise funds for the additional military expenditure which is robbing the Plan of the money it needs. And what is that addition to the defence budget for? It is for running an armament race with America-aided Pakistan. How much cheaper it would have been for some one to go and set matters right with America on this mistake of hers, instead of introducing taxes which the world had hitherto never even tried

and for which misinterpreted authority is found in our *Artha-sastra,* describing the times when taxation was at its lowest in India. Surely one need not despair of convincing the good people of the United States that Pakistan is not going to be attacked by Russia, that Pakistan itself does not apprehend it and that what the arms aid to Pakistan has done is only to set up a minor armament race between Pakistan and India, which is likely to hamper the real progress of both Pakistan and India and make them both more vulnerable to any subversion that may come from communist intrigue.

September 14, 1957 *Swarajya*

THE LANGUAGE ISSUE

THE language issue may be divided into two questions. (1) What is the best medium for instruction in schools and colleges? (2) What should be the language in which official business should be done in the States, in the Central Government, in inter-State matters and between the States and the Central Government?

As to the medium of instruction, it is my longstanding conviction, and I hold to it still, that the mother-tongue should be the medium of explanation and instruction in all stages of education, that is, in the primary and high school stages and in the university courses also. No one questions the appropriateness of the mother-tongue in the primary and secondary stages but it is thought by some that in the advanced courses dealt with in university education, English might be better suited. The argument advanced is that terms of art, scientific and technical terminology, cannot be invented all at once to cover the wide and increasing field of modern knowledge. I concede the difficulty. I go very far in this : I maintain that there should be no ban on the free and liberal use of English terms even

while the process of inventing and familiarizing ourselves with new scientific and technical terms in Indian languages is going on, be it in Hindi or be it in any of the other tongues of India. In class-room lectures we may be using the foreign terminology while in popular, oral or written expositions, we might use in an increasing degree suitable new Indian terms. What I stress is that the use of foreign technical terms does not and should not imply that for that reason the entire lecture or instruction should be in English. A chemistry or botany class may be conducted in Hindi or Tamil or Marathi, although all the special and technical terms used are of Latin or Greek or English origin. This is not only possible, but is the most efficient way of imparting instruction if our aim is really to impart instruction in the subject of chemistry or botany and not to use the occasion only as an indirect means of improving our knowledge of English.

This is true for university education as much as in the earlier stages. Everyone interested in the true progress of our people wants that attention to English language and literature should not slacken in our educational schemes just because we have attained freedom from British rule. Freedom from British rule should not mean escape from English literature. It is absolutely important that we should maintain the study of English and conserve what we have achieved in that respect. English is an international medium of great value and as far as we are concerned it is the language of modern science. The knowledge of English possessed by the educated people of India is a great national asset and should not be thrown away. But the importance that we should attach to the study of English as a language subject should not be allowed in our educational schemes to eclipse the importance of other branches of knowledge. If English is adopted as the medium of instruction in all subjects, the language becomes almost the main aim of all effort and the instruction in the science or other substantial subjects dealt with will suffer in efficiency. We are likely to learn English through science rather than science through English. In order to maintain a proper standard of English knowledge it is not necessary

to sacrifice the ease and clarity of understanding that we gain, if we adopt the mother-tongue as medium in the teaching of science and other such subjects. We should teach and we should learn sciences and other subjects. We should also maintain a good knowledge of English. The two aims are different and should be kept apart.

We should avoid a confusion that persistently clouds this issue of medium of instruction. That English technical and scientific terminology should be used in teaching science or other such subjects does not mean that the entire explanation and instruction should also be couched in English and that the students should get all their knowledge only through the difficult channel of a foreign tongue. Latin terms are used in botany and other science lectures in England and Scotland and America, but the lectures themselves are in English. Similarly whatever English or Latin names and phrases we may use, we should explain things for the students in their mother-tongue and this can be done without any detriment to precision or fulness of understanding. It is not to be assumed that the use of Hindi or Marathi or Bengali or Tamil to teach a science involves the laborious translation of all the special terms of that science. The scientific terms that prevail in the English-speaking world and with which the Indian teacher is so familiar may be continued just as they stand, even if the professor explains the subject in an Indian language. Neither teacher nor student need struggle with correct English idiom and English grammatical construction in order to advance scientific knowledge.

Nor is it to be assumed that if subjects are taught through the mother-tongue the students should slacken their attention to English literature. The best standards can and should be maintained both in the substantial science subjects and in the study of English literature. A lot of vague talk on either side has been heard and vehemence has taken the place of clarity in discussing this issue. Even Greek and Latin and Sanskrit as languages are taught in the English universities through English.

Surely science and technology may be taught also in our own languages although we use English technical terms.

So far, English was being learnt by us not only when English as such was being taught, but also when other subjects were being dealt with. If the medium of instruction in all subjects is changed from English to the regional tongue, there is no doubt that from the point of view of instruction and practice in the use of the English language, we shall lose a great deal. But though one of our aims is to learn English, it should not be done at the cost of other equally important subjects of study. The loss has therefore to be made up for by extra attention bestowed on exercises in English composition (spoken and written) and on the study of English literature.

Now coming to the question of the official language, the biggest language group of the people of India is the Hindi-speaking population. This may be admitted straightaway. If India is to be one people, in politics, in commerce and in arts, Hindi is the one language that must claim attention from all the people of India besides their own regional language, whatever part of the country they may be living in. Trade cannot for long remain confined within the borders of one language area. So it is impossible to confine the literary and cultural or political activities of the people within the boundaries of a linguistic area. If an Indian citizen desires to be cultured and educated in a true sense, he must be able to express himself and feel at home wherever he may be in India. A man whose ambition is to be a cultured Indian cannot enclose himself in his mono-linguistic shell. It follows that a sound knowledge of Hindi must be one of the aims of all education in all parts of India. Hindi is bound to be the national language of India. The progress of communications and commerce is certain to bring this about.

But the process can and should be accelerated by deliberate plans of education, that is, by teaching Hindi to all boys and girls in all the schools in the South. The question of what the official

language of India should now be is a different thing and must be answered on the basis of facts, expediency, justice and fair-play, and not solved by a process of wishful thinking in anticipation of what education can possibly achieve in the next hundred years.

The language spoken in a State should be the language of official work in that State. If it is a bilingual State, both the languages there should be recognized as official languages. It should not be, it can never be, a matter of rule by majority. Official documents should be multiglot, irrespective of the relative sizes of the two or three language groups in the bilingual or trilingual State. We have on this question instructive precedents in Belgium, Finland, Switzerland, South Africa and Canada, which it would be wise for us to follow.

As for the Central Government and for inter-State communication in India, my view is that English should be the official language. Official reports and documents have to be in a language which happens to be in fact the most convenient medium for such inter-State use. There can be no doubt that, as a result of historical causes, English is the best medium for such purposes. The persons now dealing with inter-State and Central Government papers in all the States are able to handle the English language with ease and precision, more easily and with greater precision than even their own mother-tongue as far as high level official work goes. The history of two hundred years which has produced this result cannot be wiped out by wishful thinking. It has nothing to do with the status of freedom.

It is not wise to throw away an asset that we have acquired on grounds of pride or prejudice. In all parts of India the people who are qualified for the public services at all significant levels have a very fair knowledge of English. In many parts of India they have not a knowledge of Hindi at all or anything like what they have of English. It would be unreasonable and amount to waste of a national asset to discard English for these

purposes, on the ground that free India must change over from English to some one of the Indian languages.

Where an official document has to be issued to the public, it will of course have to be issued in the language of the people of that area, but so far as the departments are concerned, it would be absurd in the extreme to decree that inter-State or Central Government correspondence should originate and issue in Hindi in areas where Hindi is not understood or spoken. It would create confusion and be a source of annoyance and grave error. To turn out every official who has no adequate command of Hindi and employ only Hindi-knowing persons in the public services would be unfair and unjust, even if it were conceivable.

When we impose a language as the official language we have to consider many issues of justice and fairplay and expediency. We cannot shut our eyes to these considerations and go by mere arithmetic-majority when we directly or indirectly exercise statutory compulsion. If the people not speaking Hindi had been scattered all over, being a small minority everywhere, the position would have been different. But the fact is that in large and compact areas Hindi is not spoken, and the millions of men and women living in those areas speak other languages. The principle of overall majority would be misleading and cannot be applicable, under such circumstances, in the matter of language.

Equality of treatment and non-discrimination must find implicit acceptance as a sacred principle in democracy. In Switzerland under Article 116 of that country's Constitution, three languages, German, French and Italian are constituted the Federal Official Languages. By Article 127 of the South African Constitution, English and Afrikaans are the official languages of the Union, and are treated on a footing of equality. Proceedings of the South African Parliament are kept in both languages and all bills, acts and notices of general public importance or interest are issued by the Government of the Union in both languages. In Finland, Swedish is spoken by only nine per cent of the

population but Finnish and Swedish are both the official languages of Finland. In Canada too both English and French stand on an equal footing. So also in Belgium, Flemish and French are both given equal place.

In applying this principle of justice and fairplay in India, we meet with the difficulty of having to accommodate more than ten main languages prevailing in various areas in the country. We cannot say, all or none. We must find a way out of the difficulty which will come as near to justice and fairplay as possible. There can be no better solution than having Hindi and English together to function as the official languages of the Union. The history of the last two hundred years will justify this solution, as based on fairplay and conducing to equal convenience for all. The wishes of the non-Hindi areas should prevail in this matter.

In any case, even if the decision be that Hindi should ultimately be imposed on all India as the medium for Union official work and inter-State affairs, logic requires that compulsory instruction in schools must precede such a bold step and it must be effectively carried out for two generations or more before we can think of such imposition. And we must be prepared to face the feelings and sentiments that any imposition of that kind must generate in the minds of the large masses of people to whom Hindi is a new language. Hesitation on the question of compulsory Hindi in schools in all areas is inconsistent with a policy of making Hindi the official language of the Union. The imposition of Hindi as the official language in place of English will be followed by greater bitterness of feeling than what is apprehended as a result of the introduction of compulsory Hindi in schools.

An argument is often advanced—which on the face of it would seem to be conclusive—that the official language of a country should be one that the vast majority of the people can understand, and that only in that way can the purpose of democracy be fulfilled. English is understood by only a very small

percentage of the people of India whereas Hindi is understood by over 60 per cent of the total population; so Hindi must be the language of all official work in the Republic : this is the argument of those who do not realize the feelings and do not place themselves in the position of the millions who do not speak Hindi and who live in the large non-Hindi States of India. If, as we take for granted, the official work of all the States composing the Union Republic is conducted in the regional languages, there will be a complete identification between the language of official work and the language of the people in every State. We should be content with this. The Central Government serves all the people of India and all the States. If it should conduct its work in Hindi—and not in English-and-Hindi as proposed herein—the people of the non-Hindi areas will not find any fulfilment of the democratic ideal on the basis of which the argument for Hindi is advanced. Where vast populations in many States do not speak Hindi or any language related to that stock, it will be seen that the argument of identity of language between government and people breaks down completely.

A law relating to language which by its effect relegates to a secondary and unequal status whole populations of many States would be a gross infraction of the fundamental law of democracy. A language may belong to one of the constituents of the population of India and it may be a majority group. But it would be undemocratic to raise it to an official position by which the other language groups would be consigned to an inferior position in actual practice. Any law or rule that tends to bring a great and continuing advantage to the people speaking a particular language and a great handicap and dis-advantage to other populations, who have equal membership in the Union, is not a just law. What is not just must be scrupulously avoided. The will of the majority must prevail in democracy, but it would be a misinterpretation of democracy and amount to oppression, if democracy is interpreted to mean the *conferring of advantages* on the majority. The strength and vitality of a State would be weakened by such oppressive laws. The will of the majority

should be exercised *for the equal benefit* as far as possible of all the people including the minorities.

Did you not learn English ? You can therefore learn Hindi ! Little do people who utter this argument realize what it means. Do they desire the Hindi-speaking people to be looked upon as the English people were looked upon ? As alien oppressors ? God forbid. Let us spread, by word and action, an atmosphere of love and not a feeling that in democracy too there is tyranny inherent. Group tyranny is much more painful than individual violence.

September 14, 1957 *Indian Finance*

MAJORITY AND LANGUAGE

A gentleman from Uttar Pradesh writes a letter in a leading Delhi newspaper that is typical of the abysmal darkness that prevails in the minds of even educated people in upper India about the difficulties and distress of the millions living outside that linguistic area. " The move of 70 Congress M.Ps from non-Hindi-speaking States to postpone the implementation of the constitutional provision for making Hindi the official language of the Centre " fills this gentleman, we are told, " with a sense of dismay. " It fills people's minds here with equal dismay to see this ignorant and ungenerous attitude on the part of citizens whose mother-tongue happens to be the language chosen for overall imposition. Those to whom the language is totally new, lock, stock and barrel, cannot be so enthusiastic about the advantages of unity or uniformity as those to whom it is the language of their own homes from baby-life onwards. If Congress M.Ps, seventy in number, have objected, is it not the duty of Hindi-speaking statesmen to try to see why this has happened, rather than being dismayed or distressed ? " Instruments for promoting

solidarity and oneness of the country must be forged." This is right. But is the Hindi idea an instrument that promotes solidarity or is it likely to promote dissension rather than unity? It is even now somewhat obvious that it will promote discord, not unity. The imposition of Hindi, a language totally strange to a compact mass of people numbering many millions living in the south of Bharatavarsha, against the expressed wishes of the elected representatives of those people who have felt the strength of popular dissent so greatly as to be compelled to lodge their protest, although they belong to the ruling party, is not an 'instrument of solidarity' but a measure leading to the direct opposite of it. Language one-ness is a good thing but it is neither necessary for national unity nor a wise bargain, if language one-ness is imposed and as a result we produce discord and ill-feeling and separation of hearts. It is not at all a good bargain if we impose Hindi and replace good feeling by a sense of tyranny and injury.

It is not difference of language that created discord and division in our past history. Attempts to impose unjust tyrannies caused them. The lesson from history is clear that we should not impose what would at once put large groups of people and a whole big mass of Indian territory at a disadvantage and give the rest a permanent advantage. We must have English for the administration of the country.

The argument of majority is fallacious. The majority is limited to a specific area. To the other areas Hindi is as good as a foreign tongue. It is not a genuine majority opinion of the people of India based on thought and circumspection, but a mere relative largeness of territorial occupation, and a bias in favour of one's own mother-tongue, and a near-to-apathy feeling about the difficulties of a large though somewhat smaller part of India.

Trade and cultural expansion are bound to bring the importance of Hindi to the attention of non-Hindi areas, and all people are bound to appreciate the advantage of learning to speak and write that language. The continuance of English as an adminis-

trative all-India medium wil not interfere with the normal peaceful infiltration of Hindi. It is unnecessary in the interest of Hindi to do something that will develop into dissension and feelings of hostility. What is necessary to do is to make people learn Hindi in the schools all over India, but, for this, we ought not to impose as a sanction a disadvantage and a tyranny that will create ill-feeling. The loss would be greater than the profit if this be done.

Every State, as distinguished from the Centre, must conduct its official work in the language of the State. This will bring about one-ness of language between the people and government. Overall Hindi as the official language of the Central Government will not do it. Let Delhi, U. P. and M. P. Governments work in Hindi, but let not English be disturbed but continue in the affairs of the Centre. This will prevent discord and ill-feeling and misunderstanding while the people will find at the same time their spoken tongues being the medium of official work.

A parliamentary committee has been nominated to examine the Language Commission's report. But this committee has been elected on the principle of proportional representation. It will therefore reflect the majority in the Lok Sabha, which again reflects the population numbers. The mischief of Hindi majority will therefore continue and we are in no better position than before. The Commission at least discussed the matter with witnesses, although, as the members who have dissented have observed, with bias. The parliamentary committee is likely just to give findings according to its own composition. This is a very grave matter affecting the future of all our young men undergoing higher education in the South.

September 21, 1957 *Swarajya*

NO IMPOSITION?

Now and then the powers above give the assurance that it is not their intention that Hindi should take the place of, or hamper, the progress of the other Indian languages. No one for a moment fears that Hindi could ever replace these Indian languages. Where the language is a mere dialectal or local variation of standard Hindi, Hindi will of course oust it. But other Indian languages, including the languages of the South, have strength enough to withstand any such attempt on behalf of Hindi. The point is that the people who speak these other languages will suffer, not their languages. The people will suffer in numerous ways in spite of their language and their literature being quite alive.

There is also an assurance, often repeated, that Hindi will not be 'imposed'. One cannot exactly understand what this exactly means in the face of all that is being done to make Hindi the sole official language of the Central Government and the sole inter-State medium. However, there is this assurance. Let us ask that this assurance be given effect to. The best way to do it is to make it clear by a statutory provision that no change will be made in the matter without the consent of the legislatures of all the States. A step that affects all the States ought to have the consent of every one of them. Till then, the present medium of official communications and documents which has been suffered without any inconvenience these two centuries and during the ten years after Independence should continue. This would be the fair meaning of non-imposition if it is really intended to be followed as a doctrine.

What is to be done is to arrange for the learning of Hindi all over India. It is imperative that the language spoken in the greatest part of India should be learnt by the school-going population in that part of India where it is not spoken. This

should be arrived at for its own sake and not in order to make it now or at any future time the official language for everybody. When the spread of Hindi knowledge is achieved, the required consent to make it the sole official language may be obtained. If it is not obtained and it is thereby proved that it would be a cause for inconvenience to the people of some parts of India, it should not be done. To make it the official language and use it as a sanction against non-Hindi areas is violence. Language is not of lesser value to those to whom it belongs than other belongings. It would not create unity but discord to seek to impose Hindi on non-Hindi areas by making it the sole medium for all-India official business.

September 28, 1957 *Swarajya*

AMERICAN AID TO PAKISTAN

I have written pretty plainly both here and in the American press about the error of American military aid to Pakistan. I hope one day the gravity of this erroneous policy will be recognized and that India and Pakistan may be released from a worthless and ridiculous armament race and be enabled to spend their resources on real development, without having to mortgage their independence to foreign Powers.

This programme of U. S. military aid to Pakistan was, I know, originally proposed when Mr. Chester Bowles was U. S. Ambassador in India. He was able to convince his Government that it was utter folly. It is after he left and when he was no longer in any way connected with the U. S. Administration that this arms aid to Pakistan became U. S. policy. When Pakistan representatives announced willingness to sign an anti-Soviet alliance with America, if the latter would provide that government with a large amount of military equipment, the

U. S. Government acting on right instinct refused to take it seriously.

The proposal was transferred to the military authorities for examination, as a prolonged enquiry of that kind served to politely shelve the proposal. But later, somehow, the matter was leaked out to the press. This was done during a period when there had accumulated a good deal of anti-Indian feeling in the States and stupid suspicion of Indian policy as regards Moscow. A great deal of pressure was developed and the U. S. Government felt bound to accept the offer of 'friendship' from Pakistan as against India's false 'neutrality' which was supposed to be equivalent to pro-Moscow bias. The military leaders of U. S. A. had no full understanding of the political and other consequences of such an alliance. Thus we have now this heavy armament race between India and Pakistan which is eating into our vitals, costing us a steady Rs. 50 crores additional spending every year on defence and deterrence. God knows how much greater this annual addition will grow to in the near future. The position is most regrettable from every point of view.

American policy narrowed itself into a military gully. But the people of America will not, I am sure, allow this to go on indefinitely. A change must come. The beginning of it is bound to be a stoppage of this most pernicious military equipment aid to Pakistan which has not only worked as a destructive neutralizer of any other kind of aid to India, but as an accelerating drain of native resources, impoverishing both Pakistan and India and aggravating the vulnerability of this part of Asia.

October 5, 1957 *Swarajya*

SELLING INDIA!

SPEAKING to some interviewers in America, our Finance Minister is reported to have referred to the difficulties of getting immediate response in the United States to his appeals for aid and said that he would have to 'sell India' for that. What a grim and unintended meaning lies hidden in the phrase that came so ready to our Finance Minister's tongue! 'Selling India' in a different and melancholy sense is a process involved, in more or less degree, in every dependence on aid from abroad. It is true, though that was not what Mr. T. T. Krishnamachari intended to admit. Worse than getting our broader policies involved as a result of a monetary bargain is the unspoken consequence of a huge obligation in a world already so greatly entangled in conflicts and alliances for battle, cold or hot. Then there is America's biggest of all plans, to have nuclear weapon superiority, no matter what happens to the health of the world or to future generations in the process of acquiring that superiority. Then there is India's moral obligation to resist that process. Of course when the poison is seen to begin working even among the children of New York, the eyes of American mothers even in this generation may open. This has perhaps begun already, leading to an outspoken opposition, to all nuclear programmes in America itself. But American military advisers move with blinkers and policy in the United States is now ninety per cent military strategy and nuclear technique. India loaded with American aid will find her voice enfeebled.

T. T. K. must sell India. And anything is permissible in advertisement. Some papers in India have spoken out roughly and appealed to the P. M. to note the contradictions. But public opinion generally is now so mute in India that error will have its way pretty easy.

What has to be done is to summon up the courage to fight with the moral weapons given to us by Gandhiji, which, like the Pandavas, we have hidden in the top of a tree wrapped up in skin. Let us see our way to tell Pakistan and America that we are not going to run an armament race and if Pakistan insists on ruining herself, we shall not help in that process of a drive for mutual bankruptcy. Let us stop this useless armament race and save our moneys for building up prosperity. Let us tell the world that we have unilaterally started disarmament and demonstrate that strength issues out of that policy as day issues out of night. Not arms bought in feverish haste from the armament dealers of U. K. or America or elsewhere, but a prosperous people at home are the deterrents of enemy aggression. And let us provoke a race in prosperity instead of in arms.

October 12, 1957 *Swarajya*

A FALLACY ABOUT RELIGION

An attempt to speak without speaking any particular language is not more hopeless than the attempt to have a religion that shall be no religion in particular.

—SANTAYANA

SOMEONE wrote in 1903 : 'Scepticism is acquired nowadays in the womb'. We have improved since then. We are less sure of our 'science' now than in 1903 and less sceptical. But in this part of the world in the South, the half-educated have been taught by less than half-educated leaders to deny everything generally held sacred. And they deny it most cocksuredly. There is no sense, they think, in reverence, in worship and in the rituals associated with religion. Occasionally they

condescendingly concede a Supreme Power to whom they attribute the usual qualities of universal immanence, omnipotence, etc., but refuse to subscribe to any particular form of worship, except such academical mental concession as just described, if that be counted as worship.

Conceding immanence, they do not stop to enquire whether the Incomprehensible may not be after all worshipped through anything whatsoever in this wonderful earth, even 'stocks and stones', painted pictures and figures in three dimensions as well as through mental figures of a more or less elusive form.

Every Hindu seeks to worship God Almighty through the images and pictures and symbols before whom he prostrates, as when one offers homage to a hero's photograph one pays it to the hero and not to the picture. The devotee does not put the image as against the 'true God' and attribute a power to the idol to war against Jehovah. The image is a holy focus for what his religious philosophy has taught him through the ages.

A place of worship is chosen even by those who have forbidden images. Holy books are revered just in the same way. But apart from this, why cannot we take it that the incomprehensible all-pervading Power is in the stone or the tree as He is anywhere and everywhere else? Is it that He is everywhere else, but not here on which the devotee pours his abundant and unquestioning faith? It would be as cruel as illogical to hold that view. The Power of the incomprehensible Supreme Being is in the smallest atom that is fixed in the material world as in the hazy pictures we make in our minds or we think we can form in some anthropomorphic shape out of verbal descriptions.

Those who aspire to bring up a boy or girl or to persuade an adult to be religious must teach him or her to be a Jew or a Catholic or a Protestant or a Hindu or a Muslim or some-

thing else. There is no escape from this limitation. We cannot teach a person to revere beauty, if we at the same time habituate him to hate women and to treat a rose or jasmine, or towers and spires, with contempt and disfavour. To love or revere the abstract, doing the opposite to concrete things that possess in some measure that very abstract and through which one can contemplate the abstract, is an attitude born of ignorant conceit. You cannot love the Indian nation whom you contemplate in your mind if you dislike every individual Indian or group of actual men and women of India whom you see with your eyes. The general is the mental product of the particular, and cannot be isolated and put in opposition to the things that actually hold the general. The dawn holds the hues, and the hues themselves hold the joy of colour. You cannot worship or admire just colour in isolation. You have to worship and admire the dawn.

"Be true to your own religion, grasp the general that is contained in the particulars of the worship that is taught therein" —this is the only way to teach men to be religious. And it is the best teaching we can give to one another if we belong to different faiths and disciplines. We cannot make new synthetic or de-particularized religions in cold blood. They will turn out to be shoddy stuff. They will be as uninspiring as index pages or official forms given to us to fill up.

We teach religion only when we do something beyond conveying knowledge. Letting a man understand what the doctrines are is just giving knowledge, not teaching religion. Religion represents total ways of life, patterns of thought, feeling and action. We really teach only when we induce the person taught to adopt certain moral and aesthetic attitudes, certain views and beliefs, which at once begin to shape his behaviour and his life.

Of all the more important religions in the world, Hinduism is one that specifically includes in its tenets and in its discipline

the faith that 'all ways lead to God'. It demands an equal regard for all forms of worship. Other religions do not seem to go so far as Hinduism does in this respect. That this is so is due to historical causes. Whatever the causes may be this catholicity in Hinduism is unique. By reason of this, Hinduism is a religion that makes it quite easy for one who is devoted to it to say to others, whoever they may be, to be true each to his own faith and his own religious observances. It is a recognition of holy truth, not latitudinarianism or indifference. Hindu managements of schools and colleges can, therefore, find no difficulty in accepting all kinds of religious instruction for which the *alumni* may opt. Indeed, Hinduism not only permits but enjoins an attitude of equal regard for all faiths.

What is His form is the eternal and unanswered question about God.

> இல்லதும் உள்ளதும் அல்லது அவன் உரு - எல்லை
> இல் அந்நலம் புல்கு பற்றற்றே.

So sang Nammalwar. "He is not like anything that is known or anything that can be imagined. Infinite good is He. Hold on to *Him* desiring nothing else." Yet Nammalwar (who said this) poured his soul out in the temples where the people worship.

Everything that is good holds something of Him and from it flows its own particular goodness and its particular beauty. You can enjoy Goodness and Beauty only by surrendering your love and reverence to the good and beautiful things that you see around you or to the symbol that you build up for the purpose of contemplating it. You cannot deny Divinity to the symbols that men have worshipped and hope yet to build up and sustain a mental idol of your own or teach others to do it, through words or a fleeting idol that you make in your mind, which in comparison is probably no better than that which faith and reverent ardour have found for themselves in the temples, myths,

legends and sacred books of the millions. It is the faith that gives the 'idol' its quality and its power. That is why Hinduism asserts that all ways lead to God and not only this way or that.

If he believes in the catholic tenets of his own faith let no Hindu think less of any faith because it insists that its way is the only truth. Even this is an incident of that faith which, as I have pointed out, a true Hindu has to tolerate and respect. The claim for exclusive truth is just the shape that devotion takes in those cases.

Can you speak without speaking a particular language? asked George Santayana. Some may say that music is such a language that speaks to all. A little further thought however would show how far only, and not more, music can play the part of language. Religion without being some particular religion, could only go so far as music can do in the communication of thought. Again, when you sing, you must sing a particular *raga* or a few *ragas,* one after another. You cannot produce music in the abstract. He who does not enjoy any *raga* in particular but admires music in the abstract is an essayist, not a lover of music.

There are people who believe that morals can be taught and sustained without belief in a Supreme Being and without religion. What gives to the looking-glass or mirror its ability to function is the tin and mercury foil behind it, the silver as it is called. If that tears away you may carry on for some time. But when it is gone altogether the glass will not work. When God and Religion are gone, morals will be just that kind of mirror.

October 19, 1957 *Swarajya*

THE RIDDLE OF THE UNIVERSE

THE riddle of the universe, the great 'open secret' as Carlyle would call it, has baffled man ever since he began to think deeply. It must ever remain an insoluble paradox. But we cannot reduce its importance by confessing our inability to solve it, nor by refusing to look at it. If we cannot tender our awe and reverence to God as the Seers of the world did, if our modern knowledge has rendered us too conceited for this, let us confess our humility before at least this paradox.

What is the Hindu attitude to, and interpretation of, this eternal riddle? The attitude is one of reverence as opposed to conceit or indifference. The 7th, 9th and 15th chapters of the *Gita* contain the interpretation of Hindu philosophy on this matter.

The universe moves according to what are known as the laws of nature. This code of nature that we derive from observation of the sequences of material phenomena is, according to the Hindu interpretation, the manifestation of the Supreme Will. God Himself is not seen as such and as a whole. What we see of Him we are content to call by the name of Law, physical and moral. The universe moves on as if wholly independent of God.

> Earth, water, fire, air, space, thought, reasoning and individual consciousness, these are the eightfold divisions of My nature.
>
> *Gita* VII-4

> This physical nature that I have described is My lower manifestation. My other and higher nature is the life-principle by which the universe is upheld.
>
> *Gita* VII-5

> Understand that these two constitute the womb of all being. I am the origin and that into which the universe dissolves.
>
> *Gita* VII-6

The dependence of all things living and non-living on the Supreme Spirit is illustrated in the five *Gita* slokas following this. Notwithstanding the fact that God supports and governs all, we are ignorant of it, as the process of His governance is inclusive of ourselves and all our perceptions, thoughts, reasonings and emotions. He rules through the Law and it seems as if the Law rules and not He. God is the Law and the Law is He. The two are not different, nor can there ever be a variation between them.

He is not a pretender to the throne of whom we can ask : Show your power by varying your Law. It would be like asking Truth to prove its power by untruths. So perfect is God's rule that He disappears from the scene, but he is ever present in the Law itself. This is the Hindu view of the riddle. *Yoga-maya* as it is termed in *Gita* VII-25 and the rule of Law described as *yogam-aisvaram* in IX-5 contain the Hindu interpretation of the relationship between the Law and God.

> All this world is pervaded by Me in unmanifest state; all beings abide in Me but I stand apart from them.
>
> *Gita* IX-4

> And yet beings are not fixed in Me. Behold the scheme of My sovereignty, Myself the origin and support of beings, yet standing apart from them.
>
> *Gita* IX-5

> Reflect on this, that as the mighty air everywhere moving is yet fixed in space, even so all beings are dependent on Me.
>
> *Gita* IX-6

> Using Nature, which is My own, I create again and again all this multitude of beings dependent on and bound by Nature.
>
> *Gita* IX-8

> Under My ever-seeing eye, Nature brings forth the moving and unmoving and keeps the world rolling on
>
> *Gita* IX-10

The unchangeable Law is an ever-present restriction, though within that limitation beings are free to act.

The *Santi* mantra of the Upanishads

ॐ पूर्णमदः पूर्णमिदं पूर्णात्पूर्णमुदच्यते ।
पूर्णस्य पूर्णमादाय पूर्णमेवावशिष्यते ॥

has put the matter in terse form. The universe which has issued out of the Perfect Being carries with it that quality of perfectness. The universe seems self-sufficient and perfect, because of the quality it has obtained from the Perfection, out of which it was born.

पूर्णस्य पूर्णमादाय पूर्णमेवावशिष्यते ।

October 26, 1957 *Swarajya*

PROBLEMS OF LAND

"IF the good man fails to bestow personal attention on his farm, then like a neglected wife, the land will turn its face away in anger." Thus did Tiruvalluvar put it in his chapter on agriculture.

செல்லான் கிழவன் இருப்பின் நிலம் புலந்து
இல்லாளின் ஊடி விடும்.

The duties of a farmer cannot be delegated. He must be ever attentive to earn the loving response of the land he owns, even as a husband must be watchful to get and retain the

affection of his wife. Ownership from a distance will not work. It is obvious that even in Tiruvalluvar's time, the soil had been overworked.

Again, land is very different from air and water. These may belong to all. For air and water require nothing to be done before being breathed or drunk. All that is needed is not to let the air or water suffer contamination. But, unlike air and water, land requires to be looked after very carefully with skill and knowledge, and manure and livestock before it can yield. Especially is this the case with land in our country where it has been exhausted by exploitation for many thousands of years. It is not every tiller that can be turned automatically into an owner-farmer. The farmer has to have the power to put into the land a great deal which the mere tiller has generally not the ability to do.

Yet, those who cannot be farmers have their share in the work of agriculture. They cannot be done away with. The land needs both farmers and labourers. This is what history has shown and what prevails in other countries which have the best farms.

Can we replace farmers by adding all the villagers together into one theoretical person? We can form co-operatives and give them all the land. But if we know the nature, the capacities and the incapacities of the individuals making up the co-operative, we shall see that the good farmer cannot be replaced by logic or arithmetic.

If we make all the holders of land in a village form themselves into a co-operative, holding all the land in the village, where do you draw the line? And do you exclude any of the villagers? If you solve all these problems, who will enforce the discipline among them to work for and on the land? A manager will come into being and he may be an oppressor. What sort of bureaucracy or zamindari system will grow we

cannot tell, and what joy or welfare issue out of it we cannot tell either.

We have done away with the old joint family ties. Why did we break it up? Can we manufacture joint families anew? Can rules and regulations fare better than blood and family affection did? Let us look back a little while we march forward and let us weigh ourselves by history, rather than by wishes.

October 26, 1957 *Swarajya*

AUTONOMY OF THE STATES

THE one problem that in the coming years will agitate the minds of statesmen and public workers all over India will be how to protect the working autonomy of the States against the powerful and continuous drive of the Centre drawing all power to itself. If the leaders of the people in the States do not realise this but indulge in the luxury of petty intrigue and patronage without real State autonomy, unhealthy jealousies and quarrels within each State, centering around communal groups and vested interests, are likely to grow and put on the garb of politics in the States. As things are now moving, all the States are surrendering without a struggle. They are becoming completely dependent and dole-minded. Finance has all moved to the Centre and the States have to live upon and build out of grants and favours from the Centre. State pulls against State and the Centre is graciously preferring the claim of one State to that of another and doling out bits of the Plan and gifts with strings attached. The autonomy of the States has melted away. The Planning Commission has reduced the governments of the States, both in current revenue and expenditure and in the capital account, to a position analogous to that of the feeble local bodies in the districts with which we are familiar. The provinces enjoyed relatively more power and had greater res-

ponsibilities to discharge during the British period than the so-called States now do notwithstanding all the parliamentary paraphernalia. The constitutional definition of India as a Union of States is ignored and fast getting forgotten.

The only serious issues which State governments now concern themselves with are whether Mr. A should be superseded in favour of his junior Mr. B who commands a great pull with the Chief Minister or one of his principal colleagues and who would help better to consolidate political influence. Such and other questions of this kind form the only field of provincial autonomy, although the name province has been substituted by the word 'State' on the American parallel. Responsibility having been in a real sense conveniently surrendered, petty patronage and harassment of disfavoured officials are the only politics remaining over for the State ministers and members of the legislature.

On the other hand, from the point of view of efficiency and good government, the Centre operating from a distance has become an authority exercising power without responsibility. This is because under the Constitution the Centre is not responsible in State subjects, although the subjects are in fact administered under the detailed instructions and directions of the Centre. The State legislatures are getting used to this anomaly.

This state of things has been rendered all the more possible on account of the fact that the ruling party in the States is a docile limb of the political party that rules at the Centre. Even at the party level a State government has to function as a loyal and disciplined limb of the all-India party organization.

Under these circumstances feelings are bound to grow that the interests of the State are being sacrificed wherever there is a conflict between the State and the Centre acting under the pressure of representatives from other parts of the country. The

official language issue is a glaring instance in point. The Government of Madras has not shown that alertness or strength in the matter which it should be expected to do in the face of the unanimous view of all sections of public opinion in the State that English must not be disturbed in favour of Hindi. Everyone knows that the State bosses cannot do anything against the majority decisions at the party headquarters in Delhi. This is only one instance. There are bound to be in course of time many issues of a like nature which will put the State ruling group in the wrong. The initiative for State interests has passed from the Congress to the Opposition in Madras.

The remedy for this situation is the organization of a political defence for the responsibilities and powers of the State and to compel the Centre to reduce itself to a real federal authority, with the essential minimum field of operation for such an authority. Each State must develop a united State front as against the Congress which is necessarily a Centrist party. When all the States are thus politically organized round the individual State interests, it would be easy to form an all-India federation of State fronts as an opposition to the Congress, so that a healthy balance may prevail as between the Centrist and the State pulls in democracy.

If the Congress organization itself attempted to decentralize, it would end in disaster. The Congress is not in such a healthy condition as to stand a surgical operation now. Decentralization is indeed equivalent to a surgical operation. The Congress must therefore remain a historical Centrist party. It can never fulfil the purpose of safeguarding the interests or the autonomy of the States. It is for the parties opposed to the Congress in all the various States to unite and form a State front relegating all other issues to the background and keeping only the autonomy of the State as the central core of its ideology. If this is achieved it will reduce automatically the unhealthy issues that operate now at the elections, viz., caste and communal considerations.

The elections to the State legislatures should be separated from the parliamentary elections and should be held on different dates, so that the electoral issues in the States may not be mixed up with all-India issues and strangled out of life.

There are people who live in a world of unreality and who believe that a strong unitary government could be forced into existence to govern all-India in an honest and efficient manner. They live in an old world wherein the government had to do only the policing of the country and did not interfere in other matters. Today this kind of efficient Centre has become impossible. All that is possible is a good central discipline and control over the services wherever they may be operating in India. If this is achieved, it would go far to restore efficient, good government, whatever be the broad policies that may issue out of the democratic elections in the Centre and in the States. The organization of an administrative corps of officials who can be responsible for efficiency, justly and honestly carrying out the decisions of the political executive at the Centre and in the States, avoiding friction on the one hand and injustice and discrimination due to political pressure on the other, should not be deemed impossible. It is both possible and necessary if we do not wish the administration to go hopelessly bad. Even during the short period of democratic government which we have gone through, political bosses have got into the wrong notion that democracy consists in the exercise of power to interfere in administrative details in the interest of party friends and for the strengthening of party influence. This unhealthy interpretation of democracy must be met boldly and checked if not altogether prevented.

The main political task is to stop the weakening of the States and to take measures to form an opposition to the centrist force and preserve the autonomy of the States so as strictly to limit the Central field to a true federal character.

November 2, 1957 *Swarajya*

HOLY BOOKS

THE *Bhagavad Gita* is the most handy and comprehensive source book of Hindu doctrine and ethics. It is accepted as such by Hindus of all denominations.

This holy book is a chapter in the *Mahabharata* and purports to narrate Arjuna's doubts and how they were cleared. In spite of the beauty and poetical appropriateness of this background conceived by the ancient author, we should remember that the *Gita* as a scripture of Hinduism stands apart from the story of the *Mahabharata.*

To take the Kurukshetra battle scene literally and to interpret all that is said in the *Gita* in that light would not only not help us to understand the *Gita* aright, but may even lead us to positive error. It would be a cumbersome process, again, to convert the whole of the Mahabharata story into a sustained allegory in order to save the *Bhagavad Gita* from being an authority for mere war-mongering. We should forget the Kurukshetra when we study the *Gita* as a scripture of Hindu *dharma.*

The vast social changes that have taken place since ancient books were written create for us an incapacity to judge many things found in them and difficulty to understand their meaning aright. A reverent spirit is necessary to understand any religion. To start with, a suspicion that the founders and teachers of religion in any land were skilful deceivers interested in some scheme of self-advancement or in the advantage of any particular class, and that the rest of the people were duped to regard these deceivers with unbounded reverence and affection, is foolish in the extreme. The saints and religious leaders that have commanded the devotion of successive generations of

normal human beings in any country have done so, because by direct personal contact at first and by experience handed down as tradition from one generation to another, the founders and teachers of the religion were known to their contemporaries to be good, sincere and deep-thinking men, worthy of being followed. Undoubtedly personal and class interests have perverted religion as they have perverted other institutions. But to impute fraud to the source is an unscientific attitude of mind in the investigation of truth. It is in a spirit of reverent affection that we should approach the study of an ancient scripture. We should learn to distinguish the general from the particular and thereby to extract the permanent out of what was said very long ago under very different circumstances. We should exercise our power of imagination which will enable us to do all this. This applies to the *Koran* and the *Bible* and to all holy books as much as to the Upanishads and the *Bhagavad Gita* of India.

November 16, 1957 *Swarajya*

THE DESIRE TO BELIEVE

BERTRAND Russell's writings rejecting God and immortality have been recently collected and published in one volume under the title *Why I am not a Christian.* This has been reviewed in a very able, signed article by the talented editor of *The New Statesman.* Quoting what Bertrand Russell wrote in 1930, that the right early training, the absence of violent punishment, and environment of love and a complete frankness instead of the usual taboos, can rid us of fear and hatred, Mr. Kingsley Martin says that whatever impression these words might have made twenty-five years ago, today they read oddly. They display a confidence in human reason and in the ultimately beneficent results of knowledge which has completely disappeared from a world in which science seems to be leading us either to

physical destruction or to totalitarian slavery. Mr. Kingsley Martin proceeds to say that it is this disillusionment that is driving young men away from the creed of progress of knowledge back towards religion. "Men and women now are unable to face the loneliness and aridity of the gospel of science and, therefore, though without any settled faith in religious dogmas, seek a personal religion to give them inner comfort. They do not believe, but they *desire* to believe. I see very clearly every day, there is no irrationality that the will to believe cannot overcome." These are the penetrating thoughts given expression to by Mr. Kingsley Martin. Here one is reminded of the Upanishad words :

यमेवैष वृणुते तेन लभ्यस्तस्यैष आत्मा विवृणुते तनूँ स्वाम् ।

It cannot be found by study or enquiry. It is the heart's desire that discovers it for him who controls his desires and regulates his life.

Mr. Kingsley Martin suggests to Bertrand Russell a line of thought and enquiry. "Why do you," he asks that agnostic philosopher, "still remain a passionate moralist hating cruelty and ready to suffer rather than surrender one iota of the truth as you see it? Explain the justification for your humanist faith which goes beyond the calculations of utility." Mr. Kingsley Martin raises thus the question of the origin and justification of a persistent faith in good, even when one rejects God. This is a most relevant question. It seems to me, if we make this expedition to discover the source of this perennial and holy river of man's faith in good, we shall reach the reality of God which logic has been unable to discover. This non-utilitarian faith in Good that man's mind refuses to give up testifies to the Reality. God reveals himself in man's concience, the *antaraatman* as our scriptures call it.

November 23, 1957 *Swarajya*

THE YOGA OF THE *GITA*

THE *Gita* gives us a synthesis of the way of *dhyaana,* the way of *jnaana* and the way of *bhakti.* To this the constantly recurring name, Yoga is given by the *Gita-Acharya.*

Is mediation, *dhyaana,* to be done only for the sake of meditation or is it for enabling one to shape one's action? Is *jnaana* to be sought after for the sake only of knowledge? Is knowledge by itself the aim or is it to be attained for the purpose of moulding our actions in accordance with it?

Every religious aspirant should ask these questions of himself so that he may save himself from the besetting sins of pride and selfishness. If it is only to know that I study the great books of old or hear Vedantic expositions, and if I practise mediation only that I may more and more successfully concentrate and meditate, I shall be using my opportunities and talents for no purpose that may be distinguished from selfish pleasure. All *dhyaana* and all *jnaana* must be in order to shape one's acts. It is only then that one's life can become an example to others. *Dhyaana* and *jnaana* attain a social purpose and cease to be for mere egotistic satisfaction only when they go to mould action and direct it to right ends. The sense of achievement in a search for truth or in an attempt at concentrated effort at meditation must not, in itself, be the aim and end of that effort. It must go to contribute to the shaping of activity, whatever it may be, in order that the enquiry or the practice of meditation may rise above the level of personal enjoyment.

Jnaana, dhyaana or *tapas* should end in the Yoga of the *Gita.* It is this relating of meditation and knowledge to action that is the central teaching of the Gita and gives to *bhakti* its great place.

तपस्विभ्योऽधिको योगी ज्ञानिभ्योऽपि मतोऽधिकः ।
कर्मिभ्यश्चाधिको योगी तस्माद्योगी भवार्जुन ॥

True knowledge that reaches the perfect quality denoted by the word *jnaana*, it may be said, automatically shapes action. What falls below that perfected condition is not true *jnaana*. This means that the test of perfection and true knowledge is that it shapes action and does not remain in isolation, which comes to the same thing as saying that true *jnaana* is only that which shapes action. In simple terms, right action is the end of all knowledge and all meditation.

November 23, 1957 *Swarajya*

OUR FOOD DEFICIT

At last it has been discovered that the best way of getting work done is by entrusting it to the individual and not to a body of people no one of whom stands responsible. The Prime Minister has given unambiguous expression to this lesson of experience. Let us hope the discovery will have its full logical implications and application in practice. The food 'deficit' has assumed the magnitude of a crisis. If the individual owner of land is made responsible to society to produce more and a definite percentage of increase, he will do it. But he should not be deprived of the fruit of his extra zeal. He should be made to feel that he will gain if he raises it from his land. He should not be saddled with men to assist him of whose quality he is not allowed to be judge, or of whose industry he is less than sure. If a farmer cannot evict the man who works under him, he cannot get such service from him as he is entitled to get. Servants and labourers are not to be slaves. This is true, but the servant should not be made the master

of the situation—a master who is not the legal master bound as such to society, but an unqualified master dictating to the legal master and refusing to do his job. 'Tenants' under the small owner-farmer have become no more than such peculiar servant-masters as a result of slogan-led and vote-catching policies adopted in recent times regarding land. Straightforward brutal expropriation cannot do so much harm to society as this kind of maiming the proprietor without transferring the responsibilities and interests of ownership to anyone else. Society wants someone to own the land that has to be looked after as a man looks after his wife. Nothing has contributed to the fast increasing loss of interest in agriculture as the recent unimaginative policies adopted by vote-hunting parties vying with each other, offering terms to everyone but the farmer-owners. This competitive policy to grow more votes does not grow more food.

Are we going to make up for the food deficit—a permanent and fatal deficit as shown by those who have gone into it—by low-grade industrial production enthused by ministerial appeals and exported for sale to countries that have been long ago industrialized up to the brim? Or are we hoping to tide over the food difficulty by selling oriental curios to fashionable men and women among the new rich in America and elsewhere?

Or are we going to do it by mortgaging our Independence or large chunks of it in some shape or other? We must take steps to make the backbone of Indian life, agriculture, an attractive occupation as it was once upon a time and as the older people among us remember.

It is good sometimes to look backwards with the idea of looking forward. Changes are necessary, but what is good can be made bad altogether by over-doing it.

December 7, 1957 *Swarajya*

THE *VANGUARD* FLOP

THE ego-centric illusion of man makes him judge everything, all questions of right and wrong, good and evil, even truth and untruth, from the point of view of what contributes to his sense of pleasure. That this is wrong and misleading has been pointed out by philosophers but the error persists, as it is based on the inherent nature of man's mind.

Out of evil comes often much real good. Out of failure and disappointment comes often what we ourselves afterwards recognize to be strength and lasting benefit. As time marches we often see that what was deemed good turns out to be bad and *vice versa.* Not that what we see later is the final truth, for even that may change as we go further onwards on the road of time. But relatively speaking, we see the error of our first appraisements, and know that trials and failures help and not hinder. The disgrace that has fallen on America in respect of the *Vanguard* rocket is terrible. It may be said without exaggeration that not even a great defeat in war would be felt so keenly as now America feels this great *Vanguard* flop. The reason is not only the background of Russia's recent brilliant success, but the excessive publicity which America indulged in before the experiment.

Yet we in India do not care to learn the lessons of such errors. We indulge in publicity before anything is achieved or even planned in detail. We have in recent times got to imagine that publicity itself is achievement, and the people in our vast backward country often believe that many things have been done which have been only conceived.

Apart from the lessons we in India have to learn, these recent humiliations of America may produce great good in the world context. Strength and success blind one's eye. Failure often gives the corrective to obstinacy and arrogance. If as a result

of all that has pained America, she now sheds her obstinacy and suspicion and accepts the standing offer made by her opponent in the cold war to agree to a ban on the use of nuclear weapons of all kinds, without bringing up the old plea of distrust, the world would gain a substantial victory in the battle for peace.

When one is strong, there is no inclination to drop distrust. But when one finds one's strength to be in doubt, it may be that a better inclination may replace the old attitude. There is a standing offer on the part of Russia to drop the use of nuclear weapons of all kinds and make a joint international declaration to that effect. Against this comes up distrust, demands for inspection and numberless conditions and the matter is tied up in an unravellable knot, and conferences end in nothing. It is not perceived that an open abjuration is itself a great first step and a gain; and that the rest may be tackled after obtaining that first victory.

"We are honest, but they are not!" This is what pride whispers sweetly in one's ear and so the Devil wins. The very nature of the cold war is suspicion. It cannot be put an end to unless we drop suspicion and accept statements and promises at face value. Suspicion is the argument against dropping suspicion and so we are in a terrible 'vicious' circle.

The only strategy that will serve us in the battle to end the cold war is unilateral action. "I shall not disbelieve or believe the other side. I believe in the law of human nature and I shall act myself without asking what the other fellow will do." This is unilateral action. It needs courage. It needs must be undertaken always by the stronger party. I once thought America was stronger and appealed to her. I appeal now to Russia t take the unilateral step and earn a victory more glorious t' what the Sputniks have brought her.

Russia may or may not listen. But let not the West make matters worse by multiplying the danger of a fatal burst-up

by distributing nuclear weapons among her cantonments in the continent of Europe. The danger is not lessened but multiplied by this distribution. The chances of a wrong and fatal step being taken are rendered far greater by this new perilous policy of arming all the allied nations with nuclear weapons. That these are 'tactical' weapons and not the big bomb makes no difference. The spark that would set the ultimate weapon going can be produced by any one of the allies that will hold these borrowed tactical weapons. No one will survive to sit in judgment as to who was the aggressor and what were the justifying circumstances. Annihilation will come sooner than any tribunal can be called to hear and decide. George Kennan has seen the danger and has warned. This plan of arming Europe with tactical weapons is no answer to the ICBM. The battle must be fought on the moral plane. No variation of nuclear plans can meet the situation.

December 14, 1957 *Swarajya*

IS RELIGION AN OPIATE?

A belief in God and His governance stood in the way of all class wars. The communists, therefore, who believed in the class war basis as the inevitable weapon of revolution, looked upon religion as an impediment and made it their earliest target of attack.

The Marxist slogan of religion being an 'opiate' has been taken out of the context by others and, without analysis, it has come wrongly to be believed that a belief in God stands in the way of human exertion and progress. One has only to read history to see what a great mistake this is. Nations who had the strongest faith in God and were deeply attached to their religion, whatever wrong things they might have done in their ignorance, were certainly not guilty of laziness or inertia. The history of the Mohamedans or of the Sikhs or the Crusades and

many other historical facts prove that religion is no opiate. Take even personal histories, what is there to compare with Gandhiji's or Sivaji's or Tilak's activity? Did their great faith in God act as an opiate? Indeed did it not make them marvels of dynamic energy?

When you have a creed that demands civil strife, you find religion in your way, and you therefore dislike religion and call what gives consolation in the midst of grief and distress an opiate. It is true that religion discourages civil strife and if your operations depend on the development of strife you must treat it as an impediment. Religion is the sanction for morality and right conduct, and for mutual trust. Social co-operation is based on all these. Societies hold together because of religion, whether people display it or keep it in their hearts. When religion goes down, mutual trust goes down, the conduct of men deteriorates and the nation suffers. Religion is not an opiate but a true pillar of energy. Where the leader of a revolution is made into a god and economic or political dogma made into a religion, it serves to keep men together, but where there has not been a revolution based on class war, the wearing away of religion brings about the wearing away of integrity and of social co-operation, and finally of nationhood. Man cannot dispense with God any more than he can do away with food and drink or fresh air. He who preaches God out of men's minds in India preaches social disintegration.

December 21,1957 *Swarajya*

CONGRESS REFORM

One often hears the complaint that there is no hope for the country unless the Congress improves. We may not accept this inevitability of connection between 'hope for country' and the Congress Party's improvement, because the Congress Party is

not the whole nation, nor is Congress rule *constitutionally* a dictatorship. It is not impossible that at some general election the Congress may be defeated and displaced by another party or coalition of parties who may govern and guide the nation. As things stand, however, in spite of what has happened in the State of Kerala, people feel that the Congress Party is too well entrenched in political and economic power to be dislodged by any other opposing group. It is therefore natural that the character of the Congress organization should be the focus of anxious reflection on the part of all those who desire that our country should be well governed and placed on a sound moral foundation for progress.

What has happened to the Congress organization everyone knows. The complaint about it is that, without any single person being responsible, what was at one time a body of unflinching idealists and men of vigour and sacrifice has now become a committee of careerists with power to co-opt, and not always bound by the rules of conduct known by the general term honesty. When the Congress went out of the phase of struggle and took on the role of ruling party, not only did old opponents of the Congress, with a thirst for power and even baser desires, enter the Congress Party and receive broadminded welcome for what they brought with them to the party but even many of the old congressmen soon changed into a new and different kind of men from what they were during the period of the struggle, which now needs an effort of memory to recall. The purpose and the actual work we engage ourselves in shape our minds. This natural law began relentlessly to operate ever since the Congress accepted office. Laying aside the baser and more materialistic thoughts, everyone in the Congress Party began to ask himself, "How will this measure affect my constituency and my re-election?" This motive of self-preservation in power overwhelmed all the past idealism.

It may be too much to hope for a change that will bring every congressman to say with John Quincy Adams : "I implore

that Spirit from whom every good and perfect gift descends, to enable me to render essential service to my country and that I may never be governed in my public conduct by any considerations other than that of my duty." But it may be not too optimistic to wish that something may be done to see that there shall be no dishonesty or considerations of private advantage shaping the wills and activities of our legislators and the party committees that have the power to nominate candidates and send them with Congress support to the polls. What is the step that is likely to bring about this result? What are the purges called for and what are the qualifications for Congress Party membership which, if prescribed and enforced, will tend to purify the bodies that make up the Congress political organization? The visible power of the Congress has been increased but the base is made narrow and on the base finally rests all moral strength. The inverted pyramid totters on its narrow base.

The goal of building a happy India fires the ambitions not only of young men in the colleges but in the villages. But such men have no entrance into the Congress which has become what in trade union life is called a closed shop. I need not put details into the picture. The few devoted congressmen who deplore the present state of the organization understand what I mean.

The evil has been recognized. Some changes have been made with the idea of improving things and releasing membership from the closed shop. But the changes are not likely to make much improvement and some of them are likely to make the position worse by rendering it much easier to keep favourites and henchmen in all positions of control. The power of the nine points of possession has not been taken into account. We must apply our remedy at the root of the mischief, *viz.*, the motive for making Congress politics a profession by itself and a substitute for a normal profession that feeds the nation's daily life. None but people who have a recognized and known occupation and source of livelihood, be it small or big, high or humble, should

be allowed to seek entry into Congress committees. The congressman's private life, income and expenditure, must be made an affair of the public. Like permanent officials whose bank account is now made public property and even presumptive proof of corruption, the congressman must surrender the privacy of his private life and daily account. He has to do this, not because it is good jurisprudence, but because he claims to govern and guide the nation, and to that privilege must be attached this liability. A purge calls for this obligation. Sainthood which gave him, under Gandhiji's leadership, his present power must carry with it the open life of saints and hermits. If this is done there will be a purge and the fear of God will be put into those men who have brought the Congress to its present position of what is very near to moral bankruptcy, *viz.*, an unsatisfactory general reputation.

We needed 'full time' congressmen when we were fighting the battle for freedom. But now when we are all no longer revolutionary soldiers but simple politicians, we do not like anyone to be a full time politician.

We want every congressman to be a straightforward householder. The Congress Party, it may be argued, reflects the state of the nation, and we cannot get an organization better than the elements which it seeks to represent and out of which it is composed. But if the Congress, and the Government set up by it, have to cleanse the nation of its defects and faults, we should remember that one cannot clean a house with a dirty broom. Let us clean up this broom, so that it may serve as a proper instrument of hygiene.

December 28, 1957 *Swarajya*

SPIRIT OF *APARTHEID*

YOUNG men and girls should be educated with two things kept in mind so that in the coming years they may be enabled to function as good citizens of their own nation as well as of the world. *Apartheid* or isolationist conduct in any form is a sinful thing, contrary to the brotherhood of man. All religions and the inexorable laws of human survival, both ordain the brotherhood of man, except that when we deal with physical infections, we adopt some measures of prevention. Even these should not be overdone into what may amount to cruelty or callousness.

The spirit of *apartheid* should be banished from all social behaviour. This should be kept in mind in the education of the young, if we desire education should help peace and internationalism.

Secondly, dogmatism in respect of theories of human welfare and progress, and prejudices about other people's differing manners, customs and ways of life should not be encouraged. We should bring up the young so as to have no repulsions based on such dogmatic attitudes and prejudices. If this be sincerely done we shall be furthering the cause of peace and internationalism. Set lessons on the work of the U.N.O. and such cold war literature will not help.

National governments that do not follow these two principles, of avoiding *apartheid* and dogmatic attitudes, should be continually and publicly pressed to change their policy.

If all ways lead to God so also there are many ways that lead to wordly happiness. Yours is not the only way. Particular rules as to prohibited degrees of marriage do not make for

happiness. Nor does taking one kind of meat or another. We must respect and not be repelled by differences in food, dress and other things. Manners and customs change as a result of wider human intercourse. Variations must not lead to notions of superiority expressed or kept concealed in the mind. Prejudices and wrong conceptions that happiness is related to any particular set of customs or behaviour should be shed and discouraged.

[The foregoing advice was given at the Sectional Conference on Education for Peace and Internationalism held at Madras on Dec. 29.—Ed.]

January 4, 1958 *Swarajya*

CONSEQUENCES OF HINDI POLICY

THE truculence in the voice of the South protesting against the displacement of English in favour of Hindi, which Mr. Jawaharlal Nehru does not like, issues from genuine fear of an insufferable coercion in the near future. Beyond objecting to the fact of the agitation there have been no answers tendered for the serious objections and considerations advanced against the imposition of Hindi as the Union official language. That 42 per cent of the people of India speak Hindi in one dialect or another and that English is not an Indian language are admitted by us, but we have pointed out that the distribution of this Hindi-speaking population in the States of India is such that it would be most unfair to change over from English to Hindi, when the 42 per cent of Hindi-speaking people are all in three or four States in the North and three-fifths of the sub-continent is wholly non-Hindi. No argument has been advanced on the other side, except the fallacious over-all argument of 42 per cent being the largest single group. India is not a unitary State, in which case possibly the existence of whole populations adversely affected

could be ignored on the simple ground of relative numbers, irrespective of the fundamentals of democracy. India is a Union of States and the majority of States are non-Hindi. Every State has an equal and indefeasible right in Union matters which belong to them jointly and severally.

We are not objecting to Hindi, fearing that the recognition of it as Union official language will hurt the regional languages. We have no fears that Tamil, its vogue or its progress, can at all be affected by Hindi. What we fear is that the Tamil people, not the language or the literature, will be affected, and affected very badly. What we fear also is that the Union Government's work cannot be conducted efficiently, justly or with full advertence to all requirements if Hindi displaces English in the offices of the Union administration, and we are not unconcerned in the Union's affairs. It is wrong to believe that Madrasis are better in English than others or that any kind of careerism is at the bottom of the objection.

The Prime Minister has in his recent remarks drawn our attention to the fact that the Congress Working Committee has passed some resolution on the subject assuring us that no unfair treatment will be accorded to people not very well up in Hindi. The Congress Working Committee is not the *deus ex machina* that will unravel and set right things resulting from government policy. The laws are what count, not resolutions of the Working Committee, and we foresee the consequences of the Hindi policy.

I am saying and doing what I do in order to prevent a great error and to keep India together. Whatever the form of government a nation is under, injustice to large masses of its educated people, and the consequent relegation of whole populations to the condition of chronic unshepherdedness, is certain to lead to disunity, disaffection and disintegration. Soon we will have a terrible dearth of men who are able enough, good men enough, to hold India together. Notions of viability, even

commonsense and logic will all go to the winds when people are irritated and India will, going back from English, go back to her past.

What returns will Hindi as an official language bring as against what we are bound to lose? Hindi *as a State language*, wherever it is wanted, is a sound policy, but not Hindi as the language of the Union. It is fallacious to count the populations of Uttar Pradesh, Madhya Pradesh and Bihar block as against that of the rest of India. It is not a profitable or worthwhile investment, for the sake of which we purchase the disaffection of the South, not to speak of other areas equally opposed to the change. We should take risks for some definite profit, not for mere pride and that too for an illusory form of pride inconsistent with modern conditions.

Central Government operations are not something distant and rare. They are an intimate and growing entanglement in the daily affairs of all the States. If I agreed to a change of administrative medium for the sake of avoiding a conflict with dear and respected colleagues, the people of the South would be left with no one but step-fathers to guard their interests and guide their affairs.

The Madras Government's reported memorandum agreeing to English *plus* Hindi is based on a consideration of superficialities in which the present secretariat staff is interested, more with examinations and studies and public service tests than with the root of the matter. It is dangerous to rest content with the constitutional provision permitting the relaxing of the Hindi policy by sanction of Parliament, i.e., by new laws to be introduced and passed. I am afraid this proposal would lead to a total surrender to party pressure at the top. Let us hope that popular opinion will compel the Madras Government to change its present approach and lead it to a more determined stewardship of the Madras case for continuing the *status quo*. It should ask for deletion of Chapter XVII of the Constitution altogether, and

the language controversy once for all set at rest leaving the *status quo* intact.

It is easy to mistake obscurantism for patriotism and Indian culture. The change from English to Hindi will seriously affect the interests of the non-Hindi people and place them in the hands of Hindi pandits. It will make administration inefficient. It will break up the unity of the nation. I earnestly plead that the cry of fanatics should be ignored and India saved from a great and unnecessary error. We have many things to do, for which unity and unbroken loyalty are necessary.

The one and only sound argument for a change is that we should bring about language unity between administration and the people to the largest extent possible. But this argument completely breaks down in respect of the people of the South, and they are not insignificant in numbers or entitlement to national rights. The area outside of the Uttar Pradesh, Bihar and Madhya Pradesh boundaries is very large. We must fall back therefore on the regional languages and the State governments to bring about this language unity between administration and people. If every State makes the regional language its official language, this principle will have been fully satisfied in theory as well as in practice. We must keep fairness as the yardstick for all Union policies, for fairness is the rock bottom of loyalty.

I must advert to one other matter. If anyone advises the people of the South not to learn Hindi, he is doing great disservice to them. I have made it clear, and I do so again, that I want all boys to learn Hindi. We ought to learn the languages that will help us in increasing measure in our trade and our intercourse with neighbours. Hindi people are our biggest neighbours and it will pay to learn Hindi. Some people wish to make the learning of Hindi a Brahmin-non-Brahmin affair. The air is charged with wicked suspicion and criminal stupidity. I would advise non-Brahmins and Brahmins—all—to learn to speak and understand Hindi as it is spoken. I insisted on this forty years

ago and ever since, and I insist on it now as much as ever before. But I sternly oppose making Hindi the official language of the Union.

The nationalism behind Hindi is out-weighed by other solid considerations of great importance. It would be supreme folly to change over from English. It should not be done now or on any foreseeable date. There is no sound or just reason for it. Nor need there be any shame in conducing the affairs of modern India in an international language that has the greatest vogue in the present age. It will be fully consistent with our broad-minded outlook in all matters.

January 4, 1958 *Swarajya*

CLAIMS OF HINDI EXAMINED

I do not despair of convincing my friends and fellow workers in upper India that I am not a disruptionist. I am urged by a desire to maintain the very unity of India which is the slogan of the Hindi protagonists. I hope it will be permitted to an old servant of the nation to protest and shout when he feels convinced that a change that is impending is detrimental to unity and contrary to the principles of justice.

The Congress resolution adopted at Gauhati has not changed anything substantially. The date-line remains. The reference to English beyond 1965, and what the resolution recommends to the Congress Party in that connection, do not mean anything beyond bare toleration. Of course it is greatly appreciated that in the resolution the spirit of conciliation is emphasized and impatience is deprecated. The resolution indicates a better appreciation of the difficulties under which more than 150

millions of people labour in the non-Hindi area of India in the East, South and West. But mere sympathy is no solution.

What we plead for is the removal of the sword of Damocles. The deletion of Part XVII of the Constitution is the only way to achieve this. It is not an essential part of the Constitution. The *status quo* should continue without any interference as it has been until now. Part XVII need not have been enacted at all, but, as it has been done, it should now be formally suspended. Such a decision would at once be a great and noble re-assuring gesture that will do really more for unity than what any kind of imposition of an artificially boosted official language can ever achieve. Often do men fanatically take measures with a certain object in view but, alas, those measures result in the frustration of that very object.

All the arguments advanced for Hindi are hundred per cent correct so far as changing the official language in the Hindi States from English to Hindi goes. The language of government and the language of the masses will then be the same if the Hindi areas change over to Hindi in the administration of the State. But the position is not the same once we go out of the Hindi area and apply the doctrine to the Union official language. The people of the South do not speak Hindi and the democratic argument that is so loudly shouted—of identity of language between the people and government—completely breaks down as regards those areas. Not only is Hindi not spoken or understood by them but even their educated classes who are equally ignorant of Hindi cannot deputise for the masses. What advantage is it to the masses in the non-Hindi area if the Union Government runs its affairs in Hindi instead of in English ?

Xenophobia is an out-moded form of patriotism. It is a sign of immaturity to feel shame in using a world language in our high affairs. Over and over again the inescapable injustice of imposing Hindi is sought to be covered by a cry against the foreign character of English. English is no more foreign than

our legal or parliamentary or administrative procedure, all which have been firmly adopted and confirmed for future use also. And language is just a medium while all these are the very substance of our affairs.

The communists have a reason for wishing English to go. Their policy is to isolate India from the West. Communists whether in power or without 'turn like the sun-flower to the sun', to the policies of their greatest State, *viz.*, U.S.S.R. (I am quoting from Djilas). English is a bond between India and the West and they hope that the replacement of it in official life by Hindi, will remove one of the important standards that tie us to the West.

Neither the argument of the foreign character of English nor that of democratic identity with the people's tongue is anything more than a specious plea that is far outweighed in substance by all the unfairness involved in the enthronement of Hindi in the place of English. The Gauhati resolution only means that more energetic steps must be taken from now onwards so that the complete change-over may be effected as soon as possible after 1965. Nothing can be achieved on a date, whenever it may be, unless several steps are taken from now on; and all these steps will breed illwill and opposition in the non-Hindi areas. It is not the critic of this Hindi programme that is disruptionist. It is the other way about. The Hindi programme is a disruptionist programme. He who warns ought not to be looked upon as unfriendly. It is a bad day for us all if criticism such as mine is put down to want of patriotism.

Let not the injury proposed be aggravated by an insult by proposing that jobs may be reserved for non-Hindi areas. Apart from the misinterpretation of motive, which this proposal involves, the idea itself is repugnant to a policy of adherence to merit and efficiency in the recruitment of the public service. No reservations in the Central administration and its departments should be based on territorial, communal or other grounds

irrelevant to efficiency. Such reservations cannot make up for the injustice pointed out.

All the modern knowledge that we have imbibed and have still to imbibe is associated with the English language. If the process of modernisation is to go on without deteriorating into shoddy imitation, it is necessary to maintain intimate contact with the progressive West and for this purpose it is necessary to maintain unimpaired the study of English language and literature. No one with a sense of realism would deny the intimate connection between educational incentive and the opportunities offered in the public service. The position that the study of English occupies at present in India is responsible, in the most direct sense, for such all round progress as we have made. If this position is adversely affected as a result of any policy that we adopt, the consequence will be a distinct deterioration in national progress. Some are unwilling to see it, and yield to the pull of an emotion which can be roughly described as national pride. Is not just and fair dealing by all the geographically distributed people of this great country as important at least as national pride? Justice is at the root of successful democracy and it is perilous to ignore it. The installation of Hindi as the Union and inter-State all-India language —the honour that now belongs to English by reason of the history of the last one hundred and fifty years—will result in inequality and injustice.

When and if Hindi becomes the Union official language in anticipation of its acquiring the character of a *de facto* national language, the disparity between the burden on students in the Hindi-speaking areas and those in the non-Hindi areas will assume very big proportions. Higher education is no longer an incident in the lives of a small caste. All over India it is linked to the most elementary forms of schooling. For good or ill, education such as would fit boys and girls for the public service is the ambition of the entire school-going population of India. They may drop off on the wayside, but that makes no difference. All

are at it. With English as the official language, the Southern people had no special advantage and the Hindi people no particular handicap. If Hindi becomes the all-India State language, those whose mother-tongue is a dialect of Hindi will have the clock set in their favour, and for the South it will be a setting back of the clock by a hundred years. The centenary celebrations of the universities of India indicate the time-measure of the impending injustice. If English must continue to be an essential part of schooling in order that we may not rule out modern knowledge, even though it may be dethroned from its official status, the burden on the Southern boy would be three languages—English, his own language Tamil or other, and Hindi which is to be the Union language. The burden on the Hindi boy would be much less than that imposed on the Southern boy, for in his case English would be the only addition to his own mother-tongue. The study of Sanskrit or other classics would be an optional addition to both of them. Remembering the standard that should be reached for answering examinations in the higher grades, this difference is bound to become a very heavy handicap.

There is a notion that Hindi is a related language to the languages of the South, and that Hindi will serve as a link that will bind all the dozen languages of India together. This may be true between Gujarati and Marathi, between Punjabi and the language of Banaras. But it is wholly wrong to imagine that Hindi can link Tamil to Kannada or Telugu or tie any of these to Rajasthani or Bengali. It is unfortunately the fact that whatever may be the racial composition of the people of India, the languages of India are divided between two distinct stocks and Hindi is no link or bridge.

There is no need for assuring the people that harm will not come to the other languages of India by the adoption of Hindi as the Union official language. Tamil and Bengali will flourish all right and cannot be affected by the introduction of Hindi. But the people speaking Tamil and Bengali will suffer—this is the grievance.

There is an argument couched in proletarian jargon that the objectors to Hindi are the intellectual and educated caste who have isolated themselves from the masses and that the Hindi protagonists are the friends of the poor and the unprivileged classes. This and many other like arguments are sound only if the question was that Hindi should replace English in a Hindi area as the State official language. The argument is reduced to a cruel joke and an unreality in the non-Hindi areas where the masses are as ignorant of Hindi as the educated classes. There are a few people understanding English in any Tamil village but none who could interpret a Hindi notice or order or a Hindi money order form or life insurance prospectus. When the Hindi protagonists are speaking of the masses they are obviously thinking of the masses of the Hindi area only; they ignore the masses in non-Hindi India who are no less in number.

Love of oneself may easily masquerade as love of language, and love of language as love of country. Let us not deceive ourselves or others with chauvinistic slogans. The plea of the South is a plea for justice and efficiency and it should not be put down as parochialism or disruption. We are told that Hindi is to be accepted for the sake of unity as if there were no unity now. If greater unity is the paramount need of the hour, is the adoption of Hindi, in spite of the difficulties of the Southerners, calculated to bring about that unity? By no means, I say, with all the earnestness that I can command. I have no axe to grind. I find no pleasure in quarrelling with my best friends. I want unity as much as anyone else. I want true emotional integration based on goodwill and a sense of justice done and not an illusory paper unity based on an official language imposed by enactment.

February 1, 1958 *Swarajya*

PAROCHIALISM

Jack Cade : How now, who's there ?

Smith : The clerk of Chatham ; he can write and read and cast account.

Cade : O monstrous ! Come hither, sirrah, I must examine thee. What is thy name ?

Clerk : Emmanuel.

Cade : Dost thou use to write thy name ? Or hast thou a mark to thyself like an honest plain-dealing man ?

Clerk : Sir, I thank God, I have been so well brought up that I can write my name.

All : He has confessed.

Cade : Away with him, I say ! Hang him with his pen and ink-horn about his neck.

Not all the people up in the Hindi area who demand the expulsion of English are moved by mere love of their mother-tongue. Some of the anti-English feeling is in reality merely a proletarian antipathy to all learning as is brought out by Shakespeare in the Jack Cade episode above quoted. In the South, too, this same anti-education feeling, though thinly veiled, is at the back of such support as the Congress resolution on the language issue has found.

It is not realized that the banishment of English will not leave the field clear for illiteracy and ill-equipment but the plan is to replace it by a new taskmaster.

What is parochialism ? Being interested in one's own parish : taking a narrow view of things instead of looking at matters from a broader point of view is what the word means in general usage. Who are the parochialists ? Those who find that Hindi is the mother-tongue of their district or province and insist that it

should be accepted by all, including those masses of people numbering not thousands but millions to whom it is not the mother-tongue? Or those who, listening to the call of justice and fairplay, and modern requirements, efficiency and rapid progress, insist that English, though it be non-Indian in origin, should be our language-tool at the top; while in State affairs, every State may use the regional language? Surely it is the Hindi protagonist who is parochial, not those who want the *status quo* to continue.

Man requires tools to work. It will not do to raise tools to the height of religion and get excited and fanatical about them. The modern plough has to be improved with a steel plough-share, the bullocks replaced by a tractor where the soil is hard to break. In the selection of tools at various levels different considerations come into play. The teeth in the mouth are a tool, but they should not be replaced by better grinders made artificially except when the teeth are rotten and fail to do work and instead become an obstruction. But forks and spoons, leaves and plates to eat from, tables to eat on, and mats and chairs to sit on, grinding stones and cooking vessels, these are not matters over which we should develop patriotic or parochial fanaticism. They change even in conservative homes in conservative India as knowledge improves and circumstances change.

The mother-tongue in the earlier stages of education and the regional language in official work at bottom levels corrrespond to the teeth in the mouth.

At the top, in the Union offices and in the universities, we should look on language not with the eye of chauvinism but with the eye of wisdom. "Which is the better tool?" is the only question: which is better for us and for all concerned, better for the future as well as for the present? This and this alone should guide our choice. Hence it is I stand for English at the Union level and for the retention of English studies and the study of technological and scientific subjects through English

books instead of concerning ourselves and spending time and energy over replacement of the tool, and losing time and energy for the substantial work of progress.

Let not tools take possession of our souls; let us be in command over our tools. The Union official language is just a tool and as things stand as resulting from the historical development of India, English is a definitely better tool and a juster tool. It is nobody else's property. Let not democracy allow itself to be sabotaged by false patriotism and lose efficiency and even-handed justice. We cannot be sustained altogether by xenophobia; especially is it so when the patriotism is of a spurious type, the boosting of a regional language into something it is not adapted for.

If this plan is given up and intimidation and pressure-tactics withdrawn, there is hope to make a popular form of Hindi, usually known as Hindustani, what is spoken in the mixed camps of the army and in the bazaars of upper India into a kind of all-India *lingua* for routine social purposes. It cannot serve as English does. But it can serve for the limited purposes of common intercourse. For this, however, an atmosphere of goodwill must be created. And this is not created by exaggerated claims and the threat of forced imposition and application of indirect sanctions. These create opposition all round and prevent a natural development. Giving it a humbler status, the *lingua franca* may well be taught in all the schools among other useful subjects. But modern knowledge requires the study of English, whatever may be the delusions of the Hindi leaders.

Parochialism that does not know its own parochial character but has been invested with power is a dangerous thing. Parochialism that knows its proper bounds, viz., to look after the interests of its own parish without detriment to the interests of the rest of the country is, far from being bad, a very necessary defence in democracy against power when it threatens to degenerate into tyranny.

It is definitely wrong to begin with a hypothesis that Hindi can do the work of English and tinker with an all-important machine of government, *viz.*, the language of Central official work, hoping that all will be well, when really most words have to be coined afresh and precision thrown to the winds. What is worse still is to ignore the feelings of people, impose unequal burdens on different regional populations, and look upon resistance to injustice as separatism.

February 8, 1958 *Swarajya*

PANCH - MAAYA

ALL the reasons that have been advanced to retain English as the official language of the Union and not to seek to replace it by Hindi—and they are substantial reasons—have been left unanswered, but two arguments are repeatedly advanced by the Hindi protagonists. One is that English is a language of foreign origin and not one of the Indian languages, and therefore it would be derogatory to national prestige to allow it to continue as the medium of official work in India.

Our national prestige has not suffered during these ten years after Independence and it is not going to be adversely affected if we make no change but go on indefinitely with English. Those whose mother-tongue is Hindi and who expected it to be made the official language not only in their own State governments but also at the Union level, may feel disappointed and even angry that they have had to yield to the protests of non-Hindi people, but this, far from lowering, will enhance the prestige of Indian democracy and strengthen confidence in India herself.

English no doubt entered India as the language of the foreign people whom we allowed to take possession of India. But the

secret of its strong entrenchment where it was placed, even though it was foreign soil, is that it has been to us the gateway of all modern knowledge and modern progress. It is erroneous to suppose that it has struck root in India by reason of official patronage. That we stuck to it even after Independence was not due to any pressure from abroad or force of habit only. It was due to our appreciation of its utility in more than one respect. All our hopes in the material plane are centred on the advancement of modern knowledge, and the English language cannot but be associated intimately with those hopes. It is the vast new knowledge that it brought, and has yet to bring, that is the secret of the widespread attachment in India to the English language. The claims of mere patriotic sentiment must recognize and yield to this.

The other argument advanced for doing away with English in favour of Hindi is a doctrinal one. In a democracy, it is argued, there should be identity of medium between government and the people. The language of the people must be the official language, otherwise it would be a failure of democratic integration. I do not deny the force of this argument. But I claim that the doctrine of identity of language between government and the people is fulfilled if every one of the States in the Union functions in the language of the area. There are over a dozen languages in India and millions are the votaries of each one of them, and they are located in the territories of each linguistic State. If each State functions in the regional language, the doctrine of identity of medium is completely fulfilled. The whole is the sum of its parts, and nothing remains to be done to fulfil the demands of this doctrine. On the other hand, if Hindi is made the language of the Union Government, there will be no identity between that and the language of the people of Bengal or Madras or any other non-Hindi State. It is not, be it remembered, a matter of consent or protest but a question of identity of language and we can devise no trick by which we can discover a language for the Union Government which will not leave tens of millions and vast tracts outside its vogue. The

argument that Hindi will help us to fulfil the doctrine of identity of language between the people and government is based on a delusion, either that consent makes up for a deficiency, or that two-fifths is enough fulfilment. It boils down, if we get rid of the fallacies, to a simple preference for an Indian to a foreign language, even though in either case the doctrine of democratic identity with the people's language is not really satisfied. Once again therefore we go back to the sentimental argument against English.

But let us see whether and how far the same doctrine of identity between government and the people is fulfilled in the case of the English language. All the educated people of India in all the States, all the officials of the Union and State governments all over India, have a very fair acquaintance with and command over the use of English, whereas the same is not the case by any means with Hindi or any variant of it. So then it will be seen that, although there are a dozen languages spoken in India, the educated section in any part of India commands a knowledge of English and no other single language has this vogue.

And this will continue to be so, because it is admitted on all hands that a sound knowledge of English is an essential part and will continue to be an essential part of education in India in all the States, whereas a knowledge of Hindi is still only a desideratum in most parts of India, and is still a controversial item in certain educational circles. The fact of the matter is that interest in language goes hand in hand with the modern knowledge it brings. The substance of knowledge, for which English books serve as medium, is the motive power behind the attention to that language. What modern knowledge now or in the future will Hindi bring? Can we be really dependent on translated material, translated not by men eminent in the science or the technology of which the book is an exposition but by mere translators of words? The fact of the matter is that new knowledge brings its own language, the language of the men

who have made and are making that science or other branch of modern knowledge. Anything else is second-hand and we have no time, neither we nor the young people in schools and colleges, to waste on prestige when progress depends on knowledge.

Then there is a third fallacy. We have to discard the *maaya* that Hindi is rich enough and good enough for all our purposes. Government is not an easy or simple affair in the present days. The semi-educated may fancy that his mother-tongue is as good as English and can serve every purpose. The educated may fancy that with a little exertion all deficiencies may be supplied. But language is not a mere collection of symbols made and brought together anyhow and we cannot but go terribly wrong if we think we can make Hindi as rich as English straightaway.

It is a delusion again that Hindi, such as it is, is easy to learn for all the people of India. It is by no means easy for the millions whose languages are not of the same stock. There are fundamental differences that make it difficult. Yet, I know that most Hindi protagonists who have no knowledge whatsoever of the Southern languages honestly believe that it is only laziness or cussedness that prevents Hindi being learnt. Everyone believes that his mother-tongue is the easiest of all languages and those who object to learn it are just unwilling people. The claim made on behalf of Hindi has a subtle illusion behind it. Those who speak Hindi and who find it spoken all round them, believe that it will one day become the mother-tongue of all the peoples of India. I need hardly point out that this fourth delusion is a dangerous and vain notion. The other languages of India will not die, leaving place for Hindi to become the mother-tongue of the people now speaking Tamil, Kannada or Bengali. It is not like the case of a few settler-families adopting the language of the place and forgetting their own mother-tongue. The mass and the distribution of the people speaking languages other than Hindi render any such hope an unthinkable proposition.

Fifthly and lastly, there is the greatest fallacy of all, the notion that unity is brought about by the adoption of Hindi as the official language of the Union. What is brought about is protest, dissatisfaction and discord, not unity. Hostility can be overcome by political dodging or pressure but that way heart-rankling is produced, not unity. Where the principle of justice is materially ignored, we cause a wound which will not heal easily. He who points this out is not the offender, but he who inflicts the wound.

I appeal to my brethren and friends in the North to abstain from this plan and to join with me in asking that Part XVII of the Constitution be suspended as an erroneous step taken when thought was not ripe. It would be a gesture of great value for the unity and emotional integration of India. Let no one imagine that I have lost my love for India or my concern for all its parts. Indeed it is greater than ever, and it is that which now makes me talk and write in this unpleasant way. The Hindi speaking people injure themselves in the long run by pressing that their mother-tongue should be accepted as the Union official language by those who do not speak it. I beg of them to concentrate on their work at State-level and declare the match drawn at the Union level and leave the *status quo* intact with no threats hanging over the heads of people. Let English continue.

"This stone which the builders refused is become the head stone of the corner." So the Psalmist sang. The builders had rejected it as being of curious shape, not rectangled and none of its sides square or oblong. But it became the key-stone of the arch and its strange shape was its merit. Not some one of our own languages but this strange one will keep the arch firm and all the languages together. It is the Lord's doing and marvellous in our eyes! So be it.

February 15, 1958 *Swarajya*

CENTRAL TEACHING OF THE *GITA*

THE scriptures of the great religions of the world are timeless books intended for generations of mankind and not meant only for the particular time when they were written. Not every line that is found in the *Bhagavad Gita* or in the other great scriptures must be taken as valid for all time and pitted against science and modern knowledge. Many things said therein may give place to growing material knowledge. But the spiritual content of these books is valid for all time. The story of creation and the date given for it in the Old Testament may yield to modern geological and biological knowledge. The miracles wrought by Moses or Jesus may be questioned. So also many things said in the Hindu scriptures may conflict with and yield to the better and fuller material knowledge of modern times. But so far as the kernel of the teaching in the *Bible* or the *Gita* goes it stands for ever, as valid today as when the teaching was given. Love thy neighbour, and do unto others as you would that others do unto you, the law of returning good for evil, the hope of grace from God upon repentance and surrender, these and all else that Jesus taught stand for ever and require only to be properly placed in the changing context of the times for their validity to be demonstrated. Likewise, the teaching of the *Gita* holds—what is beyond doubt—what is good and valid for our times. The synthesis of work, worship and renunciation stands out as the unrivalled lesson of the *Gita*. All work is worthy of being done well, be it hard or easy, pleasant or unpleasant, profitable or unprofitable to the individual, if it be good and necessary for the welfare of the community. Do it and do it well and with every care, said Krishna, without caring for the fruit that you derive therefrom, without craving for what you may get out of it to your own advantage. You need not reject the wages you earn. Life in the body is not possible

without work. But you must do the work for the good it does to the community. Take the wages earned, but do not hanker for what you gain by your work. The detachment exercised in not caring for the advantage that accrues to you from the work, is renunciation. You need not practise other austerities. If you work in a spirit of detachment you are a *sanyasi.* Regard the work that you do as work that you do for God and it becomes worship, without rites or ceremonies.

This synthesis of *Karma, Bhakti* and *Sanyas*—of work, worship and renunciation, is the well-known teaching of the *Gita.* It is easy to grasp this in the intellect. But what is essential and not so easy as intellectual grasp, is the daily and hourly practice of it and converting the attitude into a second nature. Life must become one unbroken stream of disciplined, detached and dedicated service. It is this that is called 'yoga'. It is this that calls for and therefore also develops self-discipline, contemplation of God in some form or other, tranquillity of mind, love of fellow-beings and all else that are set forth fully in the *Gita* and emphasised in various ways.

He who practises the *Gita* teaching and does not merely study it as a book of interest will see the connection between all its parts. It is an ancient book, but it is up-to-date and as valid today as three thousand years ago. Human psychology is the same today as when the *Gita* was given, whatever be the changed face of civilization and life, and there is no book that keeps the deep secrets of the human mind in view and gives its great lessons as the *Gita* does. What is wanted is a true interpretation of the divine word in its application to our life and our problems, and on each one of the occasions when we are perplexed or tempted. We shall find peace, strength and happiness if we find the living meaning of it. If we, on the other hand, ignore the spiritual teachings of our religions and get lost in disputation or believe in nothing but material advantage, we shall find no happiness. Instead of a lighted path, we shall find life meaningless and the way will be all dark. To deny the

soul is to kill it and you die before you reach physical death and life becomes darkness.

असुर्या नाम ते लोका अन्धेन तमसाऽवृताः ।
ताँस्ते प्रेत्याभिगच्छन्ति ये के चात्महनो जनाः ॥

February 22, 1958 *Swarajya*

EDUCATION AND FREEDOM

NATURE throws the child in its early years on the parent's total guidance for some years and this lasts for a good length of time until maturity is reached. The indoctrination of moral and religious ideas that necessarily follows from the family, and its place in society, cannot be avoided or objected to in any scheme of social structure. The teaching provided by the parents for their children in schools is an extension of this natural necessity.

The State's interference, direct or indirect, in the selection of the type of schooling that parents wish to give to their children, and any prohibitory impositions on private schools that serve the wishes of parents, are as much State indoctrination when done by secular democracies, as what is universally derided as obtaining in communist countries. Parents have the right to choose the schools for their children. In the interest of truth and of liberty, the State should permit every kind of school that serves any group of people. The State which supports schools with grants and assistance should not favour one kind of schools or discourage and starve out another. It would be a step towards regimented totalitarianism.

Secularity can become as bad as religion, so far as its impact on liberty goes. The negative often develops as much fanaticism as its opposite, a particular positive. We may not know which way leads to Banaras; but to shut out all roads will not take us there! Many trials are necessary to help the

discovery of truth, including the experiment of secularity in education. If we discover that morality, self-restraint and co-operation flourish and can do so for all time independently of God or hero-worship, we may adopt that easy way in preference to ritual and the burden of tradition. But if ritual and tradition are on the whole found good and useful, we may utilise them as tools that have stood the test of long trial.

The secularism of government is, without being so intended, indoctrinating secularism in the individual's private belief. Indeed, in this respect, we are doing the opposite of what we desire to do, viz., to avoid indoctrination of any kind. We are thereby doing great harm to the behaviour-level of future generations.

March 1, 1958 *Swarajya*

THISTLES

KATTA Bommu was a chieftain in South India in the days of the East India Company. He refused to pay tribute to the company which claimed it by right of purchase of sovereignty from the Nabob of Arcot, a viceroy of the Moghul Emperor in Delhi. The Indian chief's fort was besieged and he was finally forced to flee incognito to find assistance from his brother chieftains in the South. He was received by one of them and given harbour in his palace but only to be betrayed to the English company's officers. He was seized and 'tried' for his offence. The company's officer sentenced him to be hanged. Katta Bommu pleaded he had never paid tribute to anyone and that he was an independent chief in his own right. All the same, sentence of death was passed and he was hanged at once by the neck on a roadside tamarind tree within an hour after the 'sentence'. This was on 16th October 1799. On 16th October last year, the 158th anniversary of the martyr's death was celebrated all over South India.

Tippu Sultan of Mysore refused to yield to the British company and died sword in hand fighting at the breach which the company's forces had made in the Seringapatam Fort in the month of May of the same year, 1799. Katta Bommu, when he walked up to the place where the rope had been made ready for him, regretted that he had left his fort seeking external assistance instead of dying sword in hand as Tippu did. The story of Katta Bommu has been reconstructed out of old records and written in a little Tamil book which I was reading last October, the same time as I was absorbed reading Leo Tolstoi's story of the Caucasian chief Hadji Murad. The English merchants' gradual occupation of Katta Bommu's province was very much like the Russian story of reducing the mountain tribes to submission, taking advantage of the internecine feuds among them. Tolstoi introduces the story of Hadji Murad by relating how one day he was walking home by the fields and he saw the land was tilled, and nowhere was a blade of grass to be seen or any kind of plant. "Ah, what a destructive creature is man, thought I," he writes. "In front of me to the right I saw some kind of little clump and drawing nearer I found it was a kind of thistle, the same as I had vainly plucked and thrown away a few minutes before. One stalk of the plant was broken and stuck out like the stump of a mutilated arm. Each of the other two bore a flower once beautifully red but now blackened. Yet it stood firm and did not surrender to man who had destroyed all its brothers around it. What vitality, I thought, man has conquered everything and destroyed millions of plants, yet this one won't succumb. And I remembered a Caucasian episode of years ago." This is how Tolstoi introduces and tells the moving story of Hadji Murad. Katta Bommu was such another stubborn thistle. Such also was Tippu Sultan. There have been many such thistles in the march of 'civilization'. Gandhi, too, was looked upon as such a thistle by the Viceroys of India, until he succeeded and became an admired saint and hero of all lands.

March 8, 1958

Swarajya

THE ETHICS BEHIND U. S. POLICY

"I, therefore, have been deeply disturbed over what I fear to be the philosophy underlying my country's present international policies." This is what a reflecting young American engaged in post-graduate studies felt compelled to write about U.S. foreign policy, in a private letter. It set me thinking.

What is America after fundamentally? She is after security against possible military aggression of the Soviet State. How is this 'security' to be achieved? By being stronger militarily against the enemy. It makes no difference in essence if it is to be achieved through America's own single strength or through alliances and the consequent combined strength of two or more nations. The aim is to be stronger as a well-knit unit and, of a certainty, stronger than the enemy and his allies and dependents.

Now, it will be clear even after the most superficial thinking that if America or the West is to be militarily stronger and stronger by so much as to feel 'secure', the other side must necessarily be weaker and insecure against America. Is it the case that the divine right of military security belongs only to one side and not to the enemy? It cannot be so. The other side too, it must be conceded, is entitled in justice to the same degree of security. Now, if this be granted, how is the riddle to be solved? Can both sides find this 'security' which depends on one being clearly stronger than the other? If one is definitely stronger and therefore secure, the other side must be weaker and therefore insecure. It is, therefore, as plain as any axiom of mathematics, that this philosophy of 'security' is to be ethically restricted to one side only and not granted to the other party. Otherwise the aim is impossible of achievement. Two parties cannot both achieve the ideal status of security, of each being stronger than the other.

The whole doctrine of security based on superior military strength is a fallacy. Even if it were possible of achievement, it is ethically not permissible. It is out of date in the present world wherein the contending parties are evenly equipped with resources and knowledge and the capacity to arm themselves.

Security cannot come through military strength. If we distrust one another—and that is why we ask for security—there is no escape from this *reductio ad absurdum.*

Security must come, therefore, otherwise than through sheer military strength. It can come only through trust. Such risk as is always involved in trust is an inescapable incident in human life, be it individual or national. Military strength, though on the face of it an easier solution, cannot solve the riddle of security.

For security, without denying the other side the right to equal security, we must depend on what Gandhiji demonstrated, viz., the capacity to resist without military strength. Arming oneself so as to be decidedly stronger than the enemy and to be able to defeat the enemy's aggressive policies cannot hold good as a policy, unless we are blind to morality and claim it to be the right of one side only and not of the other.

To be able to deter the enemy by one's power of retaliation, although one may not be able to defend oneself if an attack is made, is the aim of the present American policy. But this can hardly be called security. There can be no security through deterrence unless one is sure that the other side agrees to be deterred. It involves complete dependence on the mental attitude of the enemy. It depends on the hope that the policy will never be called upon to prove itself and that the testing time may not arrive !

The craving for securing is the morbid reaction of anxiety. The only remedy for anxiety that is morally permissible is to

overcome the habit by developing the counter-habit of trust and courageous thinking—not to seek to arm oneself up to a degree which is to be denied to the other side.

March 29, 1958 *Swarajya*

HOW CAN I SIT SILENT?

Some people are wondering what I am doing, and why—at a time when I should know that my talents are failing and my body and mind require care and rest. My answer is that life does not work in that careful way. There is very little freedom for man except in self-delusion. You are just compelled by some inner force very different from Will.

I am fighting the great big nuclear giants, America, Russia and Britain. I am fighting as a beggar fights hard-hearted men : 'Please, sir, for the sake of God the Merciful', etc. But they won't listen. They go their own way unmindful of men in their path. For who am I to be noticed by such powerful governments? Who, indeed, when I am not able to move one inch from their ways my old, old fellow-toilers now in authority in Delhi? I have shouted and screamed : "Do not do this. It will disrupt!" But they will not budge : they will not let go their language programme. They denounce me as one who does not have national pride enough to see the obvious shame of standing up for the English language!

Indeed I have quarrelled with those whom I love, for what, some think, is a lost cause. And some dear people have the jitters because Rajaji and Nehru are quarrelling—who ought not to quarrel.

Yes, I have differed and have spoken harsh language for the sake of clarity. But can't friends differ and yet continue

to love one another ? I must quote what Austen Chamberlain said about 'a fellow member of the House of Commons who rejects my politics but shares my love of flowers' : "On reading the article when it first appeared, he wrote that he could not bear to think of me without a garden and should send me flowers from time to time on condition only that I did not write to thank him. Nearly every week during each succeeding session these gifts have been renewed. Truly the House of Commons is a place of much kindness."

My beloved colleagues and friends with whom I quarrel over this plan to replace English by Hindi know me and I believe the old Congress with all its faults, like Austen Chamberlain's House of Commons, is 'a place of much kindness'. No, the loyalties and friendships of the old guard will not be shattered if on genuine conviction we hold different views on any subject and fight hard for those views. We have no rancour in our hearts. We have suffered too much for that kind of stuff to find a place in us.

When I am convinced that this threat to replace English by Hindi and erect a throne for it in Delhi will drive a great wedge into India, how can I sit silent or speak charmingly or equivocate, and let the tragedy be enacted ? An eminent Austrian who is a visiting professor in U.S. universities has recently written : "Today, perhaps more than ever before, one ought to ponder the sentence of St. Stephen : 'A kingdom of one language and one custom is fragile and weak'." The original is Latin : *unius linguae uniusque moris regnum fragile et imbecille est.* Chauvinism is an enemy to progress and civilization.

May 3, 1958 *Swarajya*

WANTED INDEPENDENT THINKING

The political organization that successfully fought the British power in India was, at the close of that struggle, put in power by the latter. The British Parliament not only acknowledged the independence of India but transferred the reins of executive authority to the Congress Party to start with. This party continues to govern the affairs of the country after ten years of that event. It is well known or, to use the safer journalistic phrase, it cannot be denied that there is considerable searching of heart at the present moment among the leaders of the Indian National Congress. All is not well, it is felt, but no remedy has been found that meets the situation and consequently the customary attitude in similar situations in the case of individual sickness is adopted, to say that there is nothing very serious to worry about.

It is, for anyone,—and much more so for one who has spent the best part of his life-time serving the organization and who owes many honours and kindnesses to it—an undertaking of some degree of delicacy to examine into the cause of the present discontent about the Congress. If he avoids vagueness and visionary language and touches the true roots of the malady, he may "come near to persons of weight and consequence who will rather be exasperated at the discovery of their errors than thankful for the occasion of correcting them. But in all exertions of duty something is to be hazarded." I have found the words in the writings of one of the greatest political philosophers of modern times, and in that mood I venture to criticize.

As a result of tacit submission on the part of the people of emancipated India, a few good persons at the top, enjoying prestige and power, are acting like guardians of docile children rather than as leaders in a parliamentary democracy. Mutual encouragement has led to this condition of affairs. Men in a

state amounting to tutelage have no chance to develop towards maturity. This was Milton's emphatic opinion and it is as true today as in the days of Cromwell and as true in one country as in another. Although men are 'fallen', to use the poet's expression, they retain enough of the original gift of God to grow towards freedom. But a chance must be given to them to discover the precious gift that lies hidden within themselves. The sort of tutelage that now prevails gives no such chance.

No theory of civil life, no 'ism will work satisfactorily unless the citizens in the democracy are willing to undertake the responsibility of thinking and judging for themselves. This willingness and by desuetude the capacity also are rapidly decreasing. Instead of independent thinking and free judgment, the manners of parrots have been growing among men, even among those rightly credited with intellectual capacity of a high order. They repeat the words uttered by the established guardians without paying thought to the meaning and the implications. I am not objecting to any particular opinion but to the parrot culture that has seized the country.

For instance, and only for an instance, there is more than one road to national welfare. The Welfare State was the first formula adopted by the leaders; it was soon followed by the 'socialistic pattern' and then came the socialist State. Did people who successively re-uttered these phrases follow the various meanings of the various phrases? Has there been any known public or even private discussion of the merits of the various ideals connoted by these terms? Do men and women who repeat the word 'socialism', as a name for what is claimed to be the straight way leading to welfare, remember what Gandhiji said about it—Gandhiji whom they profess not only to admire but also to follow in all things? Do people, who now accept national socialism, do so after having considered and rejected the doctrine of trusteeship which Gandhiji told his disciples was his way and was preferable to the egalitarianism of the socialists and the interference by law with ownership of

property, and its traditional incidents and obligations, which socialism meant? Have men thought about the matter and all its consequences including the concentration of all economic power and influence in those who, for the time being, wield authority? Have they even thought about whether the management of things by men is likely to be carried out better when they have a proportionate interest in the good stewardship and in its results, or when they do it on salaries and on behalf of the State? Or has socialism been adopted only as parrots learn to speak?

This is only an instance. What I plead for is a climate of independent thinking among citizens. It is no good imagining it is there when we see no sign or symptom of it. Without this essential accompaniment, self-government through democracy will prove itself to be a house of cards.

The reason for a gradual collapse of independent thinking is the confusion in the people's minds between a political struggle against foreign domination and its discipline, and day-to-day government : between revolution and administration. The figures of speech employed in appeals and manifestoes, oral and written, encourage this confusion between battle and government and between the respective disciplines required for them. The long reign of popular favourites, without any significant opposition, is probably the main cause for the collapse of independent thinking. 'You have not gone far enough', 'you do not mean what you say'—these are the only criticisms that some people venture to offer. No one dares to say 'your policy is wrong and must be re-examined'. The opposition is at best a charge of inefficiency in carrying out policy or a suspicion of insincerity. There is no attack on the policy itself.

Democratic civil life calls for independent thinking among the citizens—among the governed as among the governors. Criticism and reply, and counter-reply make for health in the air. Diseases of corruption and intrigue are by a process of natural hygiene driven out in such an atmosphere. Burke said

he liked 'clamour'. "I am not of the opinion," he said, "of those gentlemen who are against disturbing the public repose. The fire-bell at midnight might disturb your sleep, but it keeps you from being burned in your bed."

If subservience and slavish adulation take the place of independent thinking and criticism is never resorted to but with fear and trepidation, the atmosphere quickly breeds the political diseases peculiar to democracy. If we have not the free and critical atmosphere of a well-balanced democracy, a Welfare State is most favourable soil for the growth of the weeds of careerism, intrigue and various types and degrees of dishonesty. An Opposition is the natural preventive for such poisonous weeds. An Opposition is therefore the urgent remedy indicated by the symptoms—not mere psycho-therapy. "You are all right. Indeed you are better than you were. Don't believe you are sick. You are *not* sick!"—this cannot restore a fractured leg. We need an Opposition that thinks differently and does not just want more of the same, a group of vigorously thinking citizens which aims at the general welfare, and not one that in order to get more votes from the so-called have-nots, offers more to them than the party in power has given, an Opposition that appeals to reason and acts on the firm faith that India can be governed well as a democratic Republic, and that the have-nots will not reject sound reason.

It is not the quality of true faith in democracy to fear that truth will not succeed with the electors. What will lead to permanent welfare the voters will accept, if not at once, at least in course of time. We must have the faith that they will see through the corrupt offers of immediate gains at the cost of injury to the general welfare. On such faith an Opposition should come into being that will set a proper balance to the authority of the party in power and put our free Commonwealth on its two feet.

Such an Opposition, even if it should not succeed in ousting a powerful majority from its seat, may at least see that its power

is not absolute power, which corrupts absolutely, but something controlled, so that the evils that flow from power may be kept within limits.

Some people frightened by the hopeless prospect of bidding against a socialist Government for the favour of the have-nots believe that the only course open is to wait for the fading away of the Congress by reason of its own weakness and diseases and then to form a new political party on right lines. This cannot be done. No party can issue out of chaos except one backed by physical force and terrorism. If we desire a parliamentary party to come into being for steadying the machinery of government, it must be accomplished when the government is running under Congress rule. It would be fatal to wait for its disintegration which will result only in rule by force.

May 10, 1958 *Swarajya*

DISTEMPERS OF THE CONGRESS

Mr. Jawaharlal Nehru's satyagraha against the Congress is over. There can be no change in the situation unless a drastic rule is enforced on the party that, barring those who non-co-operated in the first campaign of 1920 by withdrawing from courts and schools and colleges, no one should be allowed to hold any office or executive membership in any committee of the Congress or be put up as a candidate for any of the legislative bodies unless he has an occupational or other known means, be it high or low, by which he maintains himself and his family. It must be made impossible for anyone to live on the Congress or on the political influence obtained therefrom, be it at the lowest village committee level or anywhere higher up in the party hierarchy. The whole-time congressmen bossing at the various levels and parasiting

on the Congress and the rivalries, dissensions and intrigues among them have brought the organization to this pass.

A healthy nexus should be brought into being between honest family life and national life. We shall then have healthy conditions for political life. At present politics has become an alternative and attractive occupation by itself. The Congress organization has become something like a *mutt* which attracts and supports people who have no calling of their own and who obtain power over the affairs of the *mutt* itself. Need we wonder at the deterioration we deplore? The distempers of the Congress arising out of the continuance of power after the lapse of its revolutionary passion, unchallenged by any effective Opposition, cannot be dealt with merely by paternal threats from inside, which the party knows how to meet by fresh confessions of complete dependence and promises of obedience.

May 10, 1958 *Swarajya*

MINTING OF WORDS

THE Hindi Division of the Education Ministry has a full story about itself under a two-column headline in a leading Delhi paper. It is stated therein in great detail what extensive work has been done and what liberal principles have guided the adoption of new words from various regional languages of India. The story winds up with a balance sheet showing that 'equivalents for approximately two-and-half lakh words are still to be found'!

Has language ever been built this way by index makers? Language grows by speech and by writing, writing in the true living sense of the word, not by tabulated desk-work on words isolated from use.

An attempt was made by the Scientific branch of our National Government during the days of the rice-deficiency scare to produce 'synthetic rice' in the National Food Research Laboratory at Mysore; it is not known whether this 'synthetic rice' work is still going on. We do not know how many tons have been produced or whether it is still in glass jars. Can ever human credulity go to the point of believing that warehouses can be filled with synthetic rice even if they succeeded in producing some paste done into cookable and edible sago in ellipsoid form, approximating to the shape of rice? But it is *possible*, however unlikely. Much less of a possibility is it to make a language, the essence of which is that it is spoken before it is written, and both spoken and written before it can be the subject of coercion of the law.

The rationale of an official all-India language is that it is already widely spoken and widely understood. *Widely*—not by a mere group larger than any other group, but widely used all over the land.

It has been declared by the Prime Minister that the 'Hindi' sought to be elevated to the Moghul throne is a new product not understood, and of course not spoken, by any people in Delhi or even in Allahabad. The Prime Minister confesses he had all along thought it was to be some language he himself was familiar with, but it transpires that even he cannot make out the meaning when that medium is used. Are we to vote for a language that is a counterpart of the rice of the synthetic rice division of the National Food Research Laboratory? We are told that *Vidhaanaanga*, *Kaaryaanga*, and *Nyaayaanga* have been generously adopted from Kannada. The idea is that Kannada-speaking people should be grateful. The fact is that Sanskrit is better handled in the South than by the Hindi-speaking people; and the Kannada people have found some smoother and more accurate Sanskrit words than those invented by the Hindi pundits. These so-called Kannada words are not Kannada, but pure Sanskrit words which are sweeter and better than the corruptions of Sanskrit words that prevail in Hindi.

We are told that the minting of words is going on, that the task is gigantic, but that the workers are brave. One wonders why we should not continue English, which is not more of a stranger than this new language and which does not call for such extreme exertion or bravery? The Irish wrath against the British took shape in the Gaelic idea. But we in India are not so angry; indeed, we are tied to Britain by a 'sense of partnership and friendship' far beyond Mr. Harold Macmillan's expectations, as he told the Edinburgh Merchant Company at a recent dinner. Ireland has silently given up her Gaelic adventure. But we are working hard—we may guess the expense of it, which however is not the point—to manufacture our Gaelic which, it is fondly believed, will automatically put the administration in tune with the masses—of U.P., Bihar and Madhya Pradesh ! As for the rest, they do not count !

My colleague of four decades Mr. Santhanam thinks I am tilting against the wind-mills—that the Hindi fanatics are too strong for us and we should give up the resistance and ask only for time. I prefer to go down as did Don Quixote tilting against the wind-mills to surviving as one who consented to and helped gross injustice. It never can be even good policy to yield to wrong. It is wise and it is our duty to resist what we know to be wrong. There is no hope for the world unless some of us make up our minds to face odds and resist. Again, I say, we have a friend in Mr. Nehru whose conscience will eventually refuse to do injustice.

May 24, 1958 *Swarajya*

ONLY WAY TO FREEDOM

I am quoting from a recent article appearing in a widely read American journal, *The New Leader* :

"I am convinced that if the Soviet Union were by some magic to disappear tomorrow, the situation would not be eased—

we should soon be confronted by other difficulties of equally grave magnitude. I am convinced that as industrialization continues its relentless spread within the framework of international anarchy, we are going to be faced by new Germanys, new Japans, and new Soviet Unions.

"We have only seen the beginnings of rules and regulations designed to regulate and bind men's actions. The people of the United States will be driven steadily toward increased organization, increased conformity and increased control over the thoughts and actions of the individual. In the face of the powerful modern tools of persuasion and coercion, I fear that what dignity and freedom we still possess may one day vanish."

Dr. Harrison Brown, Professor of Geo-Chemistry at the California Institute of Technology, who lectured in this strain at the Minnesota University, only gave expression to a settled feeling among enlightened people all over the world. The desire to oppose and liquidate the enemy of individual freedom and personality, the active steps taken to prevent the aggression and infiltration of communism, seem to result in the loss of the very freedom which it is the aim of non-communist countries to protect by those activities. We must therefore look for the secret of freedom afresh, if we desire to guard it. Dr. Harrison Brown has hinted it.

Looking around at 'progress' on both sides of the Iron Curtain it seems that as we advance in 'prosperity' and 'civilization', we must of necessity sacrifice individual freedom.

Now is this really inevitable? Does not everything depend on what we mean by and aim at as civilization and progress? If civilization is to be bound up with material advancement we must accept its inevitable consequence, loss of freedom, in exact proportion to the forward march. And loss of freedom is loss of soul. This is as certain as the obverse of it, that if civilization is high thinking and simple living and true and abiding happi-

ness is what issues from such a way of life, civilization will bring more and more of freedom and not reduce it. If we make the mistake of confounding civilization with ever increasing material advancement, we are bound to become slaves to tyrants and to tyrant organizations—governments, parties, cartels, trusts and trade unions. If we aim at what the saints and philosophers have told us to aim at even in a changing world, there will be happiness; and individual freedom which is its chief element will increase in the measure that we realize more and more of the ideal. The inevitable corollary of material advancement is competition first among individuals and next between nations, and war and unending preparations against fear of aggression. Competition to be effective has to be organized into coercion, and as the race proceeds, the coercion must become ruthless.

The only way to freedom is the simple life and the courage to be wise even in a world that is ceaselessly busy in the opposite direction, given over to complicating life in every way that human ingenuity can do it. Co-operation which in its simple form is a joy is organized until it becomes a despotism and a tyranny of the community over the individual. It soon reaches the monstrous shape of dictatorship of one kind or another. A special type of human being is bred for the work—the ruler-type who is born to the task of extracting the implicit obedience of his fellow-citizens. 'Ways of Life' are held forth to admiration, each as effective as the other in the matter of extinguishing freedom. It is forgotten that the only way worth living is the way that Socrates, Buddha, Christ and the Rshis of India preached.

The question arises, is it possible to 'go back' to this? It is not only possible, it is not difficult to go back to it. It is much less difficult and much less hazardous than the way of ambition and war which we now blindly follow.

This is of course Revivalism. But to revive is not necessarily bad! When we have gone wrong it is better to go back

than to go forward along the same wrong path. The moral world is not a sphere like the earth where, if you go far enough even in a wrong direction, you come back to where you were. In the moral world, if we have gone wrong, we must retrace our steps. What is the vaunted freedom of the Will if we *cannot* do this?

I know that America must laugh at this doctrine of the simple life. But we may believe that America is not always wise. Prosperity *plus* tension does not make for either happiness or wisdom or religion. We see where America and Russia have both landed themselves—in the hell of endless fear under the shadow of total annihilation. What is left for *others* to do is to get rid of the *ecstasis* of false civilization and to show a new way. Who can fulfil the mission of true civilization but the people of this land of the Rshis where their words are still in vogue and are reverently recited in the very accents of those sages? Where except in India can the holy task begin?

May 24, 1958 *Swarajya*

HITLER IS NOT DEAD

THE unconcealed intimidation of a rebel army has brought about this subversion of French democracy. France has accepted De Gaulle at the point of the army's sword. He is not premier though he may be so called. He is just dictator on his own terms.

It was not a protest against the instability of the governments formed under the French Constitution. It was just a military revolt in favour of a more effective programme of repression in Algeria and the victory of force over civil authority.

The light (or darkness) of Algeria has travelled to Paris and overwhelmed it, as claimed by the French general in Algeria. People in their excitement look but a little way into the sombre consequences of their actions.

And America has hastened to welcome this dictator. America supports the autocrats of the Middle East. She runs Chiang Kai-shek in Formosa and finds that regime a place in the U.N. itself to the exclusion of all China. To crown it all now America's 'Hail De Gaulle' cheers up the army's rule in Algeria and all France and gives a new turn to the civilization of Europe.

That General De Gaulle insisted on President Coty asking him to be installed, and going through the constitutional ritual, added cold insult to the stabbing of democracy. Everyone knows that an army threat and rude violence sanctioned it, not the Constitution! Not all the perfumes of Arabia can sweet-smother this ugly truth as Mr. Michael Foot exclaimed in disgust.

"I like De Gaulle!" said President Ike. We are indeed in the Atomic Age which has replaced not only TNT, but democracy and all international law. France reminds us that Hitler is not dead.

How truly Burke saw and spoke a hundred and sixty-eight years ago:

"An undisciplined army is ruinous to society. An armed, disciplined body is in its essence dangerous to liberty. Some popular general who understands the art of conciliating the soldiery and who possesses the true spirit of command will draw the eyes of all men upon himself. Armies will obey him on his personal account. The moment in which that event shall happen, the person who really commands the army is your master—the master of your King, the master of your Assembly, the master of your whole republic."

June 7, 1958 *Swarajya*

PROVOCATIVE PAKISTAN

THE successful insurrection of the French army has world-wide consequences. The psychology of nations cannot but be influenced by the impact of a great democracy in Europe collapsing before the attack of its army. If the generals of France could, by offering to deal more effectively with Algeria, capture authority and seize the reins of power in Paris, army leaders throughout the world would naturally begin to consider the possibilities of displacing the weak administrations under which they have been working and of demonstrating their ability to give the benefit of good and efficient government to the people. Pakistan has an army that is not wanting in confidence. Her ambitious leaders cannot but imagine that Kashmir may pave the way to power, where democracy has failed to justify itself. The events that have led to the dictatorship of De Gaulle cannot but influence thought among army leaders throughout the world wherever there are not forces enough to counter-balance the power of adventitiously well-equipped standing armies. Even where conditions are not likely to lead to ultimate success, these thoughts and precedents may be enough to lead men to take the first steps and their consequences are bad enough for men to ponder over. The timing of the border events and threats on the Indo-Pakistan border must be deemed unfortunate. Apart from the ambitions of the army leaders, there is a political strategy of a type at once simple and time-honoured.

Pakistan's leaders, finding the internal troubles too severe for solution, seek to divert the people's attention in another direction. They create border troubles and issue threats about Kashmir—an obvious target for directing the thoughts of their discontented people and a sovereign remedy for disaffection. And if, on the other hand, Indian leadership too follows the same line and, as a diversion from the pressure of criticism and the set-backs of the Congress Party, encourages chauvinistic

reactions to Pakistan's untimely provocative antics, a situation may soon develop for both countries that may not be amenable to control, and invite bilateral disaster. We may lead ourselves down the garden path to foreign intervention, which would mean the collapse of independence and both Pakistan and India would succeed in writing for themselves a black page in history.

Both sides ought to remember that provocative language is of no use in dealing with a sister nation and her leaders. We cannot ridicule a sensitive people or their leaders without creating ill-will which is the enemy of civilized neighbourliness. We may talk truth and say it plainly, but there is much that can well be avoided.

In the diplomatic area, too, there is a wide scope for explaining the evil effects of the policies now pursued, not the least important of which is the Aid which sets a minor armament race going and itself becomes an incentive to provocative conduct. America should not be given up as hopeless.

What we must keep in mind as an inflexible rule is, in any case, not to be the first to do the wrong or dangerous thing. We should also remember that there is no true glory in anger and no shame in patience. If we observe these principles and do nothing smacking of dishonesty or meanness, either nation may rest assured she will not be hurt. On the other hand, foreign military intervention would be unqualified shame, what is more than shame, it would fulfil the worst prognostications of the enemies of Asiatic freedom and progress and justify their expectations, if not indeed their wishes. The world situation calls for great patience from India as well as Pakistan. It would be folly for either to rest content with blaming the other while walking into common misfortune.

It should be the joint and several ambition of Pakistan and India to belie the long-standing expectation of the brass-hats of the West that the next world-war will start in Kashmir.

June 14, 1958 *Swarajya*

THE SLUM WORLD

We live in slums in Madras. The wise ones who live in Delhi, and whose pity is great, dislike our ugly thatched roof huts and threaten to send us back to our villages. They promise to open industries and give us work there. When will they do it? Who will start industries in villages where there is no electricity and no railway line? Will the railway lines and the ports be taken there? And even if this be done, will they build us non-slum houses there?

Do they imagine we all have our own houses in the places where they will select and plant new mills and factories? Have they even gone into or seen our own huts in our villages? Do they imagine they are so many 'home, sweet-homes'? We have no water there, no drainage, underground or overground, no lights at night, no sanitation service. Our children use all the ground round our homes for such purposes and the sun and rain are our only sanitary service. We go to a well where there is doubtful water and fight for a turn there to draw some drinking water.

If a 'slum' is removed from your sight it settles itself somewhere else. What poets you are to imagine that what is not seen has just been extinguished! Do you know we prefer to live on the slope of a dirty drain in Madras, because we get work and send some money home for the wretched ones whom we have left there? We get the benefit of some public lighting in Madras which is not available in our villages.

You will make slums wherever your decentralized factory goes. Be sure of that. It is inevitable your factory out of sight will be worse than your factories under your eyes, and the slums correspondingly worse. The slum is not an accident. It is inherent in the 'progress' you have adopted, which requires

a coal-driven or electric-powered machine to be master and a number of living men and women as slaves.

You want your fastidious eyes to be saved from the sight of misery. How foolish to believe that we can be happier elsewhere, when we know what is what and have come here of our own accord. We have not changed our opinions or regret it. How stupid of you to think that factories have arisen by chance in the cities. They have reasons to be there and they cannot but be there. Move the factories out and you will be making dirty towns where they are planted, meanwhile the factories suffering losses.

The inherent nature of collective work in the machine civilization brings into being our 'slums' or our one-room 'chawls'. One cannot be sure which is the worse of the two. That depends on the relative values you give to things, men and women. If you follow the difficult path of living plain and thinking high and believe in using (not exporting) cottage-produced articles of food and wear—then the poor worker will live in his own house and suitably extend and improve it. Otherwise great people are bound to suffer the painful sight of our slums. We offer our respectful apologies for the annoyance we cause by the ugliness of our huts. Give us a little more attention in sanitary services, lighting and schools and playgrounds, and some simple social amenities. Use the law that has been passed to acquire the sites whose owners and some tout-gangs combine to exploit us and rob us of a substantial amount of what we earn. Slums are poor men's houses, the living and sleeping places of those whose work is essential for the life of those who occupy your other houses that contribute to the beauty (or ugliness) of your city.

June 28, 1958 *Swarajya*

PLAINT OF THE WEAVERS

THERE is no race of honest men and women in such a bad pass in India today as the handloom weavers. "Will no kindly earthquake come and swallow up those accursed cotton mills?" asked Charles Lamb in one of his essays. On behalf of these weavers of ours I echo that same wish. The most industrious, the honestest of workers, who shirk nothing, who do not keep looking at the clock, who organize no strikes, who throw no stones or brickbats on the police and invite death and fruitless judicial enquiries, who do not call their brethren scabs or blacklegs, who live with their wives and are fond of their children, who work all day long and nearly all night, too, at their looms, who ask for no housing schemes and have no quarrels with anyone—these are the most unhappy people in our land. What they produce, although essential and beautiful in quality, has a cruel competitor that issues out of the capitalists' powerlooms which puts the cottage weavers' cloth out of the market.

"Let the old-fashioned wear of old-fashioned people, viz., the *dhoties* and the *sarees*, be left to the old-fashioned weaver and let the new giants produce all your new-fangled wear," say I. No, this cannot be done, says Authority and the weaver and his family are left to starve. Money doles and rebates do not help them. These go to strengthen organizations, not the individual weavers whose labour calls for recognition and compassion. What good is it to see co-operative society buildings rise up in palatial style when so many handlooms cannot find admission into the 'co-operatives', and when their lot is just what it was? If only an honest citizen with a heart sees the men and women at work, and when the cloth is ready sees what quality it is, he would not hesitate to cry out against the cotton mills, as I do.

I am not pleading for an extinct culture or for an interesting tribe of aborigines whose crude songs and dances would furnish

the city ladies and gentlemen with an interesting half-hour. I plead for millions of live families who fill parts of our urban as well as the rural areas as bees fill their hives. They are not a negligible community like the bad Brahmins but a good big chunk of the population. The handloom has the largest single group of artisans in the country working on it and, if one measures by man-hours, they may well be even a bigger group than those engaged in agriculture. They have plenty of votes, let me remind the politicians, and it is worth while thinking of them well before election time and helping them to a more bearable lot in the national economy. They are not people who could be pushed into landless agricultural life nor is there room for them in any other industry. We cannot banish them from their homes and relegate them to the slums in the industrial cities. The trade unions will not let them into the factories, even if we desired to do so. These people that are struggling against odds deserve the attention and protection of Authority. The first victims are the handloom weavers when hard times arrive and it is no good bestirring ourselves then. We should do something beforehand.

July 5, 1958 *Swarajya*

IS LIFE SWEETER?

Breaking up the bonds of loyalty has become the "all-sweeping besom of societarian reformation, your only modern Hercules's club to rid the time of its abuses"—breaking up the ties of loyalty between landlord and tenant, between industrialist and workmen, between editor and working journalist. Dealing with agriculture, the supreme occupation of any society of men, we see that land has lost its value for those who had the talent and the wherewithal to look after it. No wonder that money now flows into banks which formerly used to be invested in

land, and we hear reports of increased and increasing deposits. And because these banks generously contribute a share of this to the periodical public loans floated by governments, it will be taken as a sign of prosperity. Meanwhile, more and more grains have to be imported from distant lands across the oceans to keep the famine away from India, and this with the armament expense will widen the 'foreign exchange gap'.

Who cares for land now except the economic armchair investigator? Neither owner nor tiller. Strife between the owners of land and the industrialists and the people who live by present manual labour either in the field or in the factory is not the way to happiness. But this is exactly what is deemed to be the whole duty of the political man in progressive India. To encourage such strife and mislead the numerous poor, in order that they may part with their votes—what a miserable bargain! —is not the road to social welfare.

"Are men better? Are men greater? Is life sweeter? These are the test questions," declared a well-known American naturalist and writer of this century. We are lost in a maze of imagined means and forget the end which should be kept at all stages in view.

Is life sweeter? Are men better? Alas that no one, not even the excited clientele of trade unions, can give an affirmative answer to these questions.

My own feeling, 'which may well be wrong' as they say, is that this long blind alley of error must necessarily and ultimately end in control of all citizen activities by force of law and regulation, i.e., communism, the very thing to avoid which they tell us they are doing all this encouragement of strife. Before it is too late, let us restore the value of land and let us make it worthwhile for people to devote themselves to the patriotic occupation of raising food. Let us not divide the community that is engaged in the holy task of raising food by setting one section of them against the other. The man who has the

means, the men who know and manage, the men who can toil, *all* must help one another and pool their different kinds of resources and everyone must have a chance to be happy. The men who raise the food for the people cannot all own the land, nor have they the wherewithal to keep it in good yielding condition ; most of them come to it only seasonally. Let us help them to be one community bound together by tradition and good sense. Let us not set them by the ears. They cannot be happy, or even live, unless they wholeheartedly co-operate. Let not politicians seek 'to divide and rule', a policy wholly inapplicable to internal government and welfare. Suppressing any group, calling them exploiters, we create only a new class of exploiters and the newer they are, the less responsible they are, less responsive to any moral regulation.

Look at the anarchy into which every place of work has fallen. No one looks upon work as duty. We hear a sad tale wherever we go. Four men do not do what one man used to do, be he clerk or factory-hand or shop assistant, and that too not so well as the one old-fashioned man used to do it without being driven. The slave-driver is now an abject slave himself pretending to be still master, so that his wife may not think poorly of him. This is the case even in government offices. How can the total national output improve under these conditions unless it is put down in terms of money and fictitiously boosted ?

And if the man who works on land wants to buy what he requires but which he cannot raise on the land, he has to pay for all the waste that has come to stay as the order of the day in all the workshops. We all work less and there is more of printed money about. Result : everything is dearer. We have more varieties of things before us and the problems of life have correspondingly multiplied.

Is life sweeter ? Are men better ? No, yet these are the test questions. Let good men do some honest thinking and all may yet be well,—if we but throw off the yoke of words and

slogans and bravely cope with the evils brought about by credulity and competitive party politics. Let us give up envy. "You must resign yourself to seeing others also happy, if you wish to be happy yourself," as Bertand Russel said.

July 5, 1958 *Swarajya*

POLITICAL UNITY THROUGH ENGLISH

THE 'inscrutable Orientals' still remain inscrutable to America. "A close examination of some of the images which cross our minds when we discuss the Chinese or the Indians reveals," says R. L. Walker, Professor of International Relations, University of South Carolina, "that in many respects we are probably no better informed today than we were half a century ago."

This is proved strangely by what this professor himself says in criticizing the author of a book in these terms : "He talks of the Indians, for example, in terms of a people who are really united and share overwhelmingly common national traits instead of being, as they are, a people divided by great racial and geographical barriers and speaking more than 200 different languages." There is such a deceptive thin line between truth and error that it is not easy to deal with such statements, either the one or the other. The errors of American observers may be due to the fact that their fondest notions are based upon the 'illusion of superiority' which is as genuine as generous and widely different from the airs of superiority that British rulers indulged in.

All the same, it is difficult to say whether we are really united and overwhelmingly share common national traits or whether we are a people divided by 'great racial and geographical barriers'. It is difficult again to say even whether we speak more than 200 different languages, although this mere question

of fact should easily be verifiable. Dialects, some still unwritten and mostly without any literature, can hardly be classified as distinct languages and the enormous number of '200' carries no sense. We have about fifteen written tongues each of them with a growing and very self-conscious literature. The real thing that binds the people of modern India is English and the perversity of false patriotism does not permit the recognition of this fact.

The principal phenomena of any evolution go evolving together. They cannot be understood or dealt with separately. Once upon a time what bound all India together was the great Sanskrit language in which everything worth writing, knowing or remembering was written in all parts of India. This place is taken now by English. The political unity of India is paradoxically the result of British occupation and the language of this unity is English, even as it was the language of the foreign occupation. If we wish to preserve the unity that has resulted from the national disgrace, the language too must be kept and not discarded in irrational disgust. The idea that honour demands some one of our Indian languages, some of the 200 referred to by this American professor, to be enthroned in official sovereignty will, if indulged in, be an error of the first magnitude.

History proceeds forward and can never be forced back to take a different line. What has happened directly or indirectly to the affairs of a huge population cannot be shoved about according to caprice. The mass involved is too big for such manipulation. If political unity has arrived as a result of British occupation what accompanied that double process, in the shape of language, must be not only tolerated but preserved as an essential protection for the resultant blessing.

Hindi through force, bribery, flattery, manoeuvring or undisclosed pressure of various kinds will only serve to teach that linguistic success can be disastrous politically.

July 19, 1958 *Swarajya*

CONFLICTING PULLS

ALTHOUGH India has achieved Independence and a republican form of government has been established, it should not be thought that there is therefore a state of total satisfaction in the country, so that we might without anxiety over constitutional matters attend to other business. There are pulls and stresses which are far too real to be wishfully ignored or belittled.

The liberty-urge that functioned to get rid of foreign rule is not exhausted but still works at other points. It takes new shapes in response to current conditions. This is inevitable in a people who are politically alive and whose number and distribution raise problems connected with freedom, although not quite the same as release from foreign domination.

A large nation with a continental habitation and a Central Government whose glamour cannot be always kept up at high intensity must develop centrifugal pulls. These centrifugal pulls are not new but are as old as Indian history. The movement for liberty that found partial fulfilment in the elimination of foreign rule is still at work, because the urge to be free is inherent in the human constitution. It gives rise now to regional aspirations for freedom. That good government is not a substitute for self-government was true not only during British days, but holds good even now. A republic in Delhi is no substitute for the freedom the States are entitled to. There are grievances enough in quality and measure to rouse and accentuate the desire for local autonomy even for the sake of good government. This desire has become pretty acute in recent times.

As against this inevitable and constant centrifugal pull, there is certainly, again, a centripetal force that is evolving with considerable momentum, tending to suck all power to the Centre, in excess of what has been laid down in the Consti-

tution by anticipation. This again gives rise to a corresponding reaction in the opposite direction.

We have, therefore, not altogether a state of constitutional quietude. There are strong pulls Centre-ward as well as centrifugal under a quiet exterior. I am setting out a factual appraisement of the situation and not seeking to justify by implication the one pull or the other. The naturalness or the reality of these two pulls can be no justification by itself for either having its own way. It would be most undesirable for separation to triumph in the popular mind without being apprised of all the implications. It would be equally unwise for the sake of imagined efficiency and acceleration of speed to vest all power in the affairs of this continent in a central executive in Delhi.

It may be natural for every village to desire to rule itself, for every zilla board to desire as much autonomy as is given to a State, and for a State also to desire total independent status. But naturalness of desire is not the same thing as desirability. A desire has often to be restrained, yet it must be taken into account.

The centrifugal pull or, to put it in other words, the tendency to break up into small independent States is reinforced by the ambitions of local 'majority' groups to dominate and exercise tangible executive power on the basis of a numerical superiority within that region. They do not wish to lose the local advantage of superior numbers, which they cannot command as a group in all India. Political groups other than the local majority groups may some of them nurse long-period ambitions to work up to power in all India and hope for greater success to begin with in a small State and use it as a spring-board for later activities. Such groups also would like to assist and take advantage of the contrifugal pull.

The geographical and other unalterable conditions of a large land mass such as India is, call for a treatment different

from the principles evolved in other countries under other conditions. No country or nation, and no period of history, is exactly a replica of another nation or of another period of political evolution. We cannot therefore get much help from classic literature or from history. Indeed we may go very wrong if we copy precedents.

Both the centrifugal and centripetal pulls may assume the character of disease, unless the balance is wisely maintained. If the centrifugal pull assumes a more than normal momentum, it must be treated as a symptom of ill-health and we must probe for the cause and treat the disorder. In nine cases out of ten it will be found to be some injustice or apprehension of injustice. If, again, the centripetal pull is aggravated by some ambitious or greedy department at the Centre, it should also be treated as a case for the application of restraint at the top.

Democracy suffers from a necessary evil, viz., rule by majority which may not always coincide with the rule of wisdom or even of justice. Majority rule is felt by the minorities as a form of tyranny. The groups, be they groups of individual citizens or be they States, that do not rule but are ruled cannot feel the glow of power and liberty that circulates in a democracy. They actually feel the depression of being ruled and find new tyranny in democracy, which they did not find in princely rule or in the British regime. In exact proportion to the sense of power that the majority enjoys, there is a sense of tyranny in the mind of the minority. This is often unrealized by those who have no occasion to feel it in their own bones.

And in India the majority and the minorities are more or less permanent and unalterable, because they are formed on the basis of facts and circumstances that do not admit of change by persuasion or lapse of time. This immutability of relative strength gives to every injustice a keenness of edge and makes it intolerable.

What is easily understood when applied to Muslim or other communal minorities applies *mutatis mutandis* to the subordination of some States to the rule of a majority of States or their representatives in the Centre.

There is of course a '*must*' in democracy. The majority must rule and the minority must yield. But the '*must*' does not mean that it is pleasant or that it will not produce its own consequences if not kept in mind and suitable measures taken. To make democracy at least as tolerable as it can be made for the minority, be it as between the majority and minority in one administration or as between the Centre and dissenting States, is the wisdom that is required in majority rule. This wisdom can flow only from leadership. It cannot arise out of popular thought or out of debates in Parliament.

These are days when every nation has come to maintain large and well-equipped armies. We have seen that power has a knack of easily passing over to armies, sometimes even without a blow in defence of civil authority. The training and the aloofness of standing armies furnish them with an aura of impartiality and efficiency and there are demagogues not wanting among them. Those who are interested in maintaining the supremacy of civil authority and do not desire army coups to take over the government of the country, should take particular care about good government and justice and a fair deal to everybody, because these are at the root of the preference for democratic government.

Going back to the question of the cenrtifugal pull, military governments are bound to be central rather than local. This follows from the very nature of things, for the armies of nations are not divided on a regional basis with local affiliations and interests. The separatists must remember this unpleasant truth as well as the other fact, that in modern times the viability of small regions is considerably reduced. The passions that separatism always induces are antagonistic to mutual help and

thereby regional viability is still further reduced. When even big land masses and industrial nations feel the need for mutual aid and co-operation, how can a poor and small area maintain its independent existence with hostile neighbours all around? Autonomy within a constitutional federation is a totally different matter, for there would be no hostility to be coped with. A true federation with local swaraj is the only solution of the problem.

July 26, 1958 *Swarajya*

IMPORTANCE OF EDUCATION

At a recent meeting which happened to be 'inaugurated' by the Chief Minister of Kerala, I paid a compliment to him and said that he was a man of character and proceeded to remark that good character was essential to make anyone a worthy person, to whatever political party he belonged. Strangely, this observation gave offence to many advocates of the supreme worth of the ruling party. Anger is a symptom of fear. What was it that made them challenge my maxim about the importance of character? Was it a fear that it was conspicuously absent in their ranks? Even absence does not matter so much perhaps as a public reputation about its absence. This last is fatal for any political party and my remark should have led to reflection and not anger.

Every consideration goes to indicate the importance, to the whole nation, of quality in those who make up the ruling political party. Not merely good character which is essential, but quality as a whole is very important including integrity as well as equipment. It would be a calamity if the conditions and methods of recruitment followed by the major political national party of India tend to exclude university men. I really fear this is the case at present. We may have an interesting

revelation if statistics are gathered on this subject. If it should turn out that educated young men, and more especially university youths on whom we spend so much, do not find their way into the National Congress Party but are being absorbed in professions with a total aloofness to politics or that they join parties which for one reason or another oppose the Congress, it should be matter for concern and enquiry.

Ease of manipulation by local political bosses leads to a temptation to quietly exclude educated men, but such a shortsighted policy is fraught with national consequences that are not to be desired. It should be looked into why these young men are not approached for enrolment.

Majority rule is not just the violence of numbers. Quality and in particular the broad outlook that may be called political wisdom are required in the art and practice of government, be it democratic or princely rule or a bureaucratic regime. Without skill, equipment and wisdom, no big nation, such as we are, can be governed for long. It is not well to depend merely on the accident of natural genius which no doubt oftentimes occurs and ignore the advantages of the systematic education that our universities are engaged in giving. The daily newspapers give a lot of education no doubt, but it does not require much argument to show that university education is better and safer.

The Congress should endeavour to draw educated men into its ranks and not classify them as untouchable because they cannot be treated like sheep and may give headaches to the shepherds.

July 26, 1958 *Swarajya*

ARAB NATIONALISM

To the Americans today the union of the Arabs into a great and powerful unit is a base crime, a wicked form of co-operation, a conspiracy against civilization. Anyone leading such a movement is a second Hitler who must be put down by force and no Munich tolerated.

Hitler is dead but the powerful nations of the earth see his ghost everywhere, wherever significant nationalism finds a capable leader. Unfortunately now there are difficulties facing these people who suffer from Hitler-memory, who feel that safety lies in anticipatory liquidation of all sources of terror. The difficulty is that the U.S.S.R. is not now an ally of the U.S.A. as it was when Hitler had to be defeated. They have nuclear weapons, both of them, and are on opposite sides. Liquidation cannot be undertaken except with preparedness of self-annihilation !

Mankind cannot find peace through this American and British strategy or any other like strategy. Russia's advocacy of co-existence may be insincere, may be a total fraud, but co-existence itself is not a fraud. On the contrary, therein only lies peace. Isaiah spoke the word of God to his people and that word is good and true for all the peoples that have come to live on earth : "Hear the word of the Lord, ye rulers of Sodom; give ear unto the law of God, ye people of Gomorrah. He shall judge among the nations and shall rebuke many people and they shall beat their swords into ploughshares and their spears into pruning-hooks. Nation shall not lift up sword against nation, neither shall they learn war any more. Come ye and let us walk in the light of the Lord."

The encirclement of Nasser is being completed. Nasser has become a greater fright to America than even the legendary

figure of Hitler. The union of the nations of the Arab world who are one in language, religion and manners as well as in national aspirations, is looked upon by American diplomacy as a re-enactment of Hitler's march over Europe, to be met with similarly before the new Hitler gathers more power. It may be no exaggeration to say that perhaps today even Khrushchov is not so disliked as Nasser is hated. Khrushchov has a right to be as bad as he is, but Nasser is an upstart ! This is the psychology that is hastening the Western troops into the Middle East. But in this new array of forces, there is no Stalin to help the West, but a Russia that *opposes*. And this is perhaps a great difference.

War is receding, they say. This can, and may it soon, become a truth. But it is not yet a fact. The possible strategy is that a new cloak may be put over the Western armies that should encircle Arab nationalism, calling it a U.N. force. It can bring 'peace', i.e., a suspension of war, but not satisfaction to the Arab world. Nations cannot be suppressed. They can be destroyed by nuclear poison bombs, but they cannot be suppressed while living.

August 2, 1958 *Swarajya*

THE LEBANON ADVENTURE

The Lebanon experiment of the American Government is a new adventure in administration and it is worth analysis. It is stated that American troops with powerful naval and air backing do not intend any offensive or defensive military operations against any nation. They are not fighting any enemy in the conventional sense, either by way of offence or defence. The plan is to liquidate alleged 'subversive activities' of other Arab nations and governments believed to be carried on secretly

through their agents. Admittedly working through subversion and secret methods, these agents are not coming out in the open and fighting like soldiers. Yet soldiers are to attempt to fight them ! This is the novelty of the experiment that the American adventure is making.

How is subversion to be met by an armed force, be it indigenous or be it a foreign army of 20,000 soldiers imported from America and Britain ? The government of the country must first discover and identify the secret enemies, make sure of their suspicions and utilise the physical power of the American army to cope with these elements. This can have a meaning only if the police of the local government is not itself able physically to cope with criminals. It means that American soldiers constitute themselves into a reserved armed police force giving their services to the Lebanon State. If the enemies of the present Lebanon Government are numerically so great that such an arrangement with foreign troops has become administratively necessary, it means that the present Government of Lebanon has broken down and it is only the American army that is in occupation—as the East India Company took charge of India, territory after territory.

If there is no open civil war but only subversive attempts and the government forces have not been yet outnumbered by insurgents, the question is, can conspiracies and subversive activities be ever dealt with by soldiers and guns, particularly when the soldiers are foreign nationals ? It is an attempt to do what is impossible—something like trying to hear through the eyes and to see through the ears. The end may be worthy but the means employed are wholly inappropriate and opposed to commonsense—as much as trying to disinfect the air in a house by a musical performance or remove stink by playing a military band.

The results of this American adventure will be that civil riots will have to be provoked so as to provide subject matter

for military action. Where there was order the American experiment will have to produce disorder, so as to have something tangible to cope with. Since conspiracy and subversion cannot be met by physical force, the progress of events will take the shape of seeking to convert conspiracy into alleged civil disorder : The disease will have to be modified in order to suit the medicine imported !

If the American Government is convinced that its friend the present Lebanon Government is not able to govern efficiently, the straight course would be for America frankly to get legal authority to throw away its traditions and to take over the Lebanon administration and guard it against conspiracy and subversion as it does in America in its own territory, doing all the watch and ward that fall to the lot of normal administration. Lebanon must become part of America. And as a result, America must be brought near to the land borders of Russia. And this is what is going to happen if the policy of interference in a foreign country across oceans and seas is not reversed immediately.

Has the President of the U.S.A. the right, according to the law and the Constitution of the U.S.A., to land American forces in a foreign land in order, not to keep off an enemy attack, but to prevent a change of government in that area, be it a change of the form of government by civil commotion or a change of the personnel of government by peaceful processes open to the people of that country according to their laws ? Can the President exercise such power by giving the name of 'indirect aggression' to what is going on by way of change of political opinion however brought about among the population of that country ? And even if such power be duly exercised, could it be done without authority from the U.N. ? Can the land frontiers of U.S. territory be taken so near to Russia without fresh and specific national authority ? The constitutional result and the effect of U.S. military forces seeking to preserve civil order in Lebanon, or a particular administration in office, do amount

to taking the land frontiers of U.S. territory to near the Russian border. And can this be done by mere executive authority? It gravely endangers peace and invites war. It seems these questions should be pondered over and answered. It is not a case of mere wrong foreign policy but seems also to be a breach of the law of America itself.

The argument is this : "We have planted interests in Lebanon with the consent of her lawful government and we must protect them with our soldiers if those interests are endangered by a change of foreign policy or by revolt or rebellion by misguided people." This means that every foreign capitalist will have the right to call in the soldiers of his own government to stand guard when there is a constitutional threat to the life of the then administration of that country or a change in foreign policy; that the *status quo* is a vested right of the foreign exploiter ! This would be a subversion of all prevailing notions of international commerce and the sovereignty of nations.

The Lebanon adventure is a demonstration of the law that all colonialism must take the same course. With the best of intentions America finds herself doing just what the British did, just what the Dutch did, just what any ambitious Power must do if ambition must find secure foreign fields for operation.

August 2, 1958 *Swarajya*

FOREIGN TROOPS IN LEBANON

"Mr. Murphy's skilful engineering of General Chehab's candidature," to use the language of the perspicacious editor of *The New Statesman*, has brought about conditions for an early face-saving American withdrawal from Beirut. The sooner this withdrawal and that of the British troops in Jordan are finished,

the better for world de-tension and for the American and U.K. 'face'. Persistence and pride never helped anyone in the process of getting out of an error into which one has been unfortunately led.

New Iraq has been recognized all round. Indeed, she has rejected France's offer to recognize as a superfluity. What then is left in the Middle East for an urgent peace-meeting of Powers, except it be the obstinate taste for exploitation which refuses to be entirely removed ? An urgent Summit Conference was deemed necessary when the Western troops landed in Lebanon in reaction to the change of government in Iraq. When this change has been universally recognized and stabilized beyond expectation, the cause of the trouble has disappeared and this must now be recognized. There is no need for a Summit Conference on the Middle East affairs, and there is no need for foreign troops and continuing import of equipment and ammunition. Delay in withdrawal of American and British troops must lead to suspicoins of some conspiracy or other, for which there is no lack of fertile soil in that area.

There are other matters and world-issues for a Summit Conference. As long as this cold war and the nuclear race continue to cast their baneful shadow on the world, efforts for peace must continue. The danger of nuclear weapons affects not only the belligerents but also many other and wholly innocent nations of the earth. The issues of nuclear total disarmament and the reduction of military expenditure in general all over the world do call for examination and solution. But America has made up her self-righteous mind that she is not going to benefit now by any conference of the heads of States.

The heads of governments are asked to meet because only they can declare a policy of mutual trust and lay the true foundation for disarmament, not those who thrive on armaments and the complications of distrust. This is the reason why Russia wants a Summit Conference, it is not just motivated by the

relative ill-health of President Eisenhower and the prospect of argumentative victory. The world generally hailed the proposal because people all over the world appreciated the truth that the first essential for peace was a policy of mutual trust and this could be declared only by heads of governments and cannot be worked out by files and professional arguments.

Some people in Delhi thought that a great new feather was put on India's cap when Mr. Nehru was asked to go to the Summit Conference. We are sorry for this hasty illusion. Our cap requires feathers of a different kind. Our international importance, such as it is, stands in no need of confirmation, neither can it improve by an invitation from America. We ought not to mistake effects for causes. Power is never so operative as when it is known to exist but is not brandished. This is true as much for the power of peace-enterprises as for the power of armed forces. Let our Prime Minister's power for peace grow and not be allowed to be eaten up in futile conferences. That power will not suffer by Mr. Dulles's disinclination and no one need feel sad because Mr. Nehru does not now go to New York or Geneva. Pandit Nehru has plenty to do and to undo in India and he ought to be and is glad to be able to save more time for such things.

The cold war is the outcome of distrust and fear. It can dissolve only by an improvement in that field. There is an obstinate residuary urge to liquidate the enemy whom we cannot trust and whom we fear. This animal urge to kill takes the shape of various arguments that impede the realization of co-existence. This variation of the animal instinct of killing what one fears will have to be overcome, if indeed civilization is to survive.

What makes this animalist residue in human evolution most dangerous is the latest fruit of the tree of knowledge—the energy of nuclear fission which science has placed in the hands of man and which has now entwined itself into the very economy of

industrial nations. Russia has repeatedly offered to agree to a total ban on this dangerous, aggravating element in the present tension. The West, however, seeks perfect safety. In its quest for perfect freedom from fear, it prefers to lose the chance of even a second best. This is an obvious mistake, but it takes time to realize that in this mundane world we have to be content and begin with second bests.

And going back to where we began, the Western troops in Lebanon and Jordan must be withdrawn as quickly as possible, lest other kinds of troops are invited to other parts of the Arab world by the lawful governments in *de facto* authority there.

August 9, 1958 *Swarajya*

NAVINA UTTARAKANDAM

[*Scene* : Rama's camp in front of Lanka Fort]

(*Agni presenting Sita after the ordeal*)

RAMA : You have come unscathed as I had expected ! Welcome dearest.

SITA : Lord, I entered the fire not as a test but to immolate myself, to go back to where I belong. But Agni has brought me back to earth. Give me leave to spend the rest of my days in this world in the forest with a Rshi.

RAMA : How can I part from you ? How can I grant this wish of yours ? My dearest ! Forgive me for what I did and accompany me to Ayodhya.

SITA : Lord ! It cannot be. I have done my life with you. After what you said to me when the battle was over and I

was sent for to meet you, it is no longer possible for me to join you.

RAMA : That was done to satisfy the common folk, as I am king and must live above the suspicion of vulgar weakness for women, and teach by example the common Dharma.

SITA : Do so, indeed ! For your *Avatar* was over with Ravana's death, even as the God in Parasurama lapsed when you met him on the way back from Mithila. You are just only man now. Not so is the case with me. I know who I am. I belong no more to you. I have gone back to the world of Gods and have come to live my life for some time yet before joining my Lord the Eternal.

RAMA : Are you serious or are you playing with me, dearest ?

SITA : The play is over, Aryaputra. You must be King. Your divinity is over. I cannot be your queen any longer. My divinity continues. Hanuman or Lakshmana, blessed souls both of them, will take me to Valmiki's ashram, where I shall live on the past and its memories.

RAMA : (*bowing to the Gods*) : Must it be so, Holy Sires ?

VASISHTA : So be it !

RAMA : Lakshmana, do so then. May Sita's wish be obeyed.

[*Scene* : Valmiki's Ashram]

SITA : Are these the boys, revered Sage ?

VALMIKI : Yes, Sita. These blessed youths shall be adopted by you and the world shall call them your sons.

SITA : O, they are worthy boys, my heart melts to them. Blessed be they and learn to sing the divine story as you sing it to them.

(Embraces Lava and Kusha)

VALMIKI : I shall teach them to sing the Ramayana and instruct them to go round the land telling your story, and uplifting the souls of men and women.

SITA : May they indeed be able to do it as you would have them do ! My blessings on them. Yes, they will do it, sure, and the story is all that remains.

VALMIKI : They will sing the story of your suffering and purify the hearts of sinners and delight the souls of the pious. Look upon them as your own sons from now on and may the world know them as such.

SITA : Yes, indeed, and let them melt the heart of the man Rama too, the king in Ayodhya, and all his people.

[*Scene* : Valmiki's Ashram]

VALMIKI : Are you satisfied, Sita ?

SITA : I am, Holy Sire. They sing most beautifully. (*She embraces Lava and Kusha*) I have nothing more to do here in this world. O, mother Earth ! Receive me into your bosom.

(*The earth opens out and receives Sita*)

VALMIKI : Ha ! Are you gone, Mother ? Oh, dear Rshis all, I am sad.

SAGES : It befits you not to grieve.

VALMIKI : I do not grieve, but I can't help it. I am sad, sadder than when I saw the male bird killed by the hunter.

[*Scene* : The Palace in Ayodhya]

RAMA : Who are these youths singing such ravishing music ?

VASISHTA : They have come from Valmiki's ashram. They will sing your story, King, and the story of your blessed queen.

RAMA : My story ! My queen ! Fool that I was to lose her ! (*Weeps*)

VASISHTA : Weep not. You have long to live yet and the golden image of Sita has the power to comfort you during that period and lift you above the mortal world. Shall we gather the people to hear the Ramayana ?

RAMA : Yes, Holy Sire, do so.

[*Scene* : The Palace in Ayodhya]

LAVA AND KUSHA (*Singing the Ramayana*) :

सर्वापूर्वमियं येषामासीत कृत्स्ना वसुंधरा ।
प्रजापतिमुपादाय नृपाणां जयशालिनाम ॥

etc., etc.

Rama, Bharata and others and the assembled sages and people listening feel transported.

[*Scene* : Kishkinda]

TARA : Surely, Ruma, you cannot find fault with Sita. She did the right thing in my opinion.

RUMA : When a husband claims her company, could ever a good wife refuse and ask him to remain content with a golden image ?

TARA : Sita's Lord is in Heaven. Rama is no longer her Lord. Rama shed his divinity with Ravana's death, for Narayana's work was over with the removal of the Rakshasa from earth. With the arrow that was shot out to drink Ravana's life, went Rama's divinity also.

RUMA : I cannot understand these things.

TARA : You cannot, sister. But do not blame dear Sita. How sweet is the story as the twin youths sing it. I almost forget my grief over dear Vali.

RUMA : You are great, sister. You are greater than the Rshis.

TARA : Do not confuse me with your praises. Let me go to my hut where Jambavan waits for me to tell me more about Narayana and all His sport, and about the Cowherd Boy who will come to make more wonderful things than Rama himself and teach men how to live, how to do and yet not do.

[Like Bhishmacharya of old, Rajaji is a pillar of strength to our nation. With his wisdom and courage he has been moulding the moral and spiritual shape of our people like a seasoned sculptor. Future history will record his services to this country and the world in letters of gold.

In this drama Rajaji has given a poetic interpretation of the Uttara Kanda of the *Ramayana*.—Ed.]

August 10, 1958 BHAVAN'S JOURNAL

FREEDOM UNDER SOCIALISM

AT the Sastri Hall, at a recent meeting, Mr. Arabindo Basu, Professor of Indian Philosophy at the Durham University, gave a thought-provoking talk on socialism on the background of a recent visit to Israel. Mr. Basu's point was that socialism—any form of it, anywhere—must end in complete regulation of life and the total subordination of the individual to the State. This was inevitable, he said, so far as economic matters go, and in this respect Mr. Basu saw no difference between a communist State and one run under 'socialism' as in Israel.

He expressed the fear that with economic control, the freedom of thought and freedom of culture also generally disappear, which need not, according to him, happen. He suggested, and this was his main theme in the lecture, that even though in the modern age, the citizen was doomed to be swallowed up by the State as far as economic matters go, the 'soul' of society may be so tended as to leave the citizen free in thought and culture.

As far as I can see, this appears to be a vain hope. Once we grant to the State the right or the opportunity to swallow the 'body', to use the figure which Mr. Basu employed, the 'soul' must go with it. If the economic life of the people and of every one of the individuals composing them, must be under complete regulation, the rulers will easily see that they must obtain a 'willing' obedience to such regulation. And how can 'willing' obedience be got except by moulding the brains of the citizens and by indoctrination from childhood upwards? The root of action is in thought, and if action and behaviour must be regulated, thought and culture must be shaped to it. No administration can achieve an escape from evasions by mere statutory compulsion. This is true in greater measure when the population to be regulated is very large as in Russia, China or India, and is of heterogeneous levels of educational equipment. What can be achieved in a very small State cannot be hoped for in a continental area and a population that has grown up in mutual isolation over a variety of regions. Statutory compulsion by itself must result in corruption and evasion. Regulation would be very largely nullified by disobedience and fraud to which the bureaucracy soon adjusts itself. The mind of the people would have to be brought under complete subjection if regulation in economic matters must succeed in any adequate measures. Inner law must supplement the external statutes.

And this means the totalitarian training of the mind, intense and all-pervading indoctrination, the idolisation of the State and all claims to individual freedom of thought and expression treated as heresy and treason. There can be no freedom of thought or

of culture in a State which is run on the theory of complete economic State control of the citizen's life. Temporarily and in the published statutes we might have freedoms of some kind, but the ultimate point that must be reached inevitably is the destruction of all freedoms.

So much for Mr. Arabindo Basu's thesis. There are some hopeful critics of Soviet Russian life, who have been analysing and watching trends in that country, who believe that signs are not lacking that people (though as yet only a small number) are coming into existence even in the communist world who dare to probe the limits of State control and attempt to overstep bounds. These Western critics believe that the future may belong to these heretics of the communist world who desire to break the slavery of the communist citizen : that is, that economic control may at last break down and with it the control of thought and culture also. This is perhaps more an expression of the critics' own faith in freedom as an ultimate natural urge than accurate prognosis. But, even if true, it is not a contradiction of what has been stated above in connection with Mr. Arabindo Basu's thesis that total economic control must inevitably lead to the other and more deadly control—control of thought and opinion, control of soul as one may briefly put it. If this is to be avoided, it cannot be done otherwise than by renouncing the doctrine of complete economic surrender of the citizen to the State, which is at the root of the mischief. We cannot eat our cake and have it. If freedom of thought and culture are precious and must be retained, we must bear with something short of egalitarian socialism in the material plane.

As regards the shape of socialism itself, high taxation may take the place of complete State ownership and a residue of freedom may be left with which the individual may be taught to be content. But there is a limit to such taxation. Beyond that limit, socialism through direct and indirect taxation may become even less sufferable than total State ownership. With State ownership of land and factories goes responsibility also, as

it does with a master's ownership of his slave in the institution of slavery; but an unbearable rate of taxation does not relieve the citizen of the worries of ownership and management. Losses during some years are not taken into account by the tax-gathering State which knows how to tax in good years but not to rehabilitate or compensate for bad years. These observations are of great importance in a country where socialism has *preceded* prosperity, of which India is an example. Wealth cannot be produced by equalization but only by eagerness to produce wealth. The time for egalitarianism arrives only *after* nation-wide production of wealth based on individual incentive; otherwise we must reconcile ourselves to a rigid scientifically conceived plan with coercion, slave-driving and complete control of life and soul.

If we desire real and substantial freedom of thought and culture we must be free from the total control that socialism under communism imposes as well as from the privation and misery and atrophy of interest which oppressive taxation under national socialism brings about. It is the middle path of moderation alone that can conserve the freedom of the soul and all the humanitarian emotions that make up civilization.

August 16, 1958 *Swarajya*

FOLLY TO DISPLACE ENGLISH

LIKE places of pilgrimage and the roads leading to them, certain languages play their part in different periods of history to bring people together in mutual understanding and benefit, and help them to general improvement. Greek did this in Europe once and Latin performed this function in an extraordinary measure when Europe was torn by differences and distinctions in all res-

pects. History has recorded that universal enlightenment and knowledge spread in Europe through Latin.

Sanskrit purveyed enlightenment and culture to all parts of India, although no tribe or community spoke Sanskrit as such and although the people spoke different languages in different parts of the country. People in all parts of India who aimed at enlightenment and culture made it the means and the symbol of their ambition to acquire a knowledge of Sanskrit and thereby a common bond of spirit tied all parts of India into one community.

What Sanskrit did in India during her long and silent centuries in the past, what Latin did in Europe though divided into many States and nationalities, English is doing now in India. It may not be spoken in India, but it is the language that unites all the different regions of India into one and India herself with the rest of the world. It serves as the continuous vehicle that brings into its life the best from all parts of the civilized world.

If humanity is a single family, some means of communication, some common vehicle of enlightenment and invigorating knowledge, must play its part. It is only ignorance heightened by obstinacy that would resist the part that English should play in modern times and treat the language as an enemy left behind by the British rulers. It is sheer folly to displace English in fields where it has struck root, in the administration, in the law and in the universities. Instead of welcoming the good that Providence and the Laws of Nature often give us along with shame and evil, some among the leaders of India seek to cast off with what was shameful and evil, the good also that came with it, thereby undoing the just economy of Nature that ever mixes good with evil.

There are regional languages in India, each spoken by millions and possessing a not inconsiderable amount of literature. Hindi is one of these, and one that serves a larger single group than any of the other Indian languages. On this latter ground it was thought possible to make it the official language of all

India. If this could be done, it would remove the imagined shame of a language of foreign origin functioning in India as the supreme official medium. This was adopted in the Constitution of India. A distant date was fixed to give effect to this resolution, thereby helping to keep all difficulties and objections dormant for the time being. The distribution of languages and people is such that no one of the Indian languages could be given the honour of being the Union official medium without leaving a large mass of territory, and the people inhabiting it, outside the range of that language. Although Hindi or some dialect of it is spoken by nearly two-fifths of the population of India, this is confined to a contiguous mass of territory leaving three-fifths of India out of that contiguous region.

As the date fixed for the enforcement of the provision of the Constitution regarding the Union's official language approaches and steps have to be taken towards that end, the objections to the measure have begun to find expression. The other language groups, in particular Bengal and Madras, resist the Hindi programme. It is noteworthy that in spite of the constitutional provision about Hindi having been adopted ten years ago, the Government of Madras has not adopted compulsory instruction in Hindi, and even now dares not introduce such a measure in the schools. Even if there were no resistance or if it were successfully met by government measures, it is not wise to do something that is bound to result in inequality of opportunities. To continue English as the official medium as heretofore and to let each region carry on its administration at State-level in the language of that region is the only safe, just and convenient alternative. And this would leave intact the nexus between India and the outer world which is no detraction but a high privilege.—*Envoy.*

August 23, 1958 *Swarajya*

REDUCE MILITARY EXPENDITURE

INCREASED food production is no doubt absolutely essential for national well-being. It is inconceivable that we can, by any process of modernisation, convert India into an industrial country, depending for food on imports from abroad, to be paid for by export of steel or textiles or sugar or even tea. Even if it were physically possible, it would be an incongruous lopsidedness for countries with a vast land area. Increased 'food' production is not a thing to be achieved by amendment of laws or the substitution of statutory regulations for the old-fashioned contractual relations, or by a limitation of the acreage of individual ownership, least of all by overthrowing personal interest and introducing in its place collective or bureaucratic management, through co-operative organizations. The increase of food crops calls for a programme of constructive help and encouragement, enlargement of holdings, and fostering increased interest among the farmers : certainly not of sowing discord among the elements who have to co-operate, and tinkering with agrarian affairs so as to cause land values to move down to vanishing point.

Increase of food production is to be attained, if at all, by stages which are necessarily slow, for which the exchange crisis cannot wait. Bankruptcy would overtake us and upset the whole cart. The one and only way out of the crisis is a reduction of military expenditure. This reduction is not only possible but also desirable from every point of view. The Government must run the gauntlet of anti-Pakistani fanaticism and do this reduction. It requires great courage and decision, but it is this and this alone that can save calamity. It will be called reckless, a policy that will 'sell India' to the enemy, and so on. But it should not be minded if we wish to save the country. The arms race started by American military aid to Pakistan can be stopped only

by unilateral action on our part. Indeed, we should shame America into decency in this matter by taking such a bold step, even if there were no crisis in our foreign exchange relationship calling for economy in expenditure. Investment in arms equipment for air, naval, and ground warfare on the pattern, though on a smaller scale, of the Western Powers, is as fantastic and unreal as the stockpiling of nuclear bombs by them, knowing all the while that they are never to be used.

Every consideration points in the direction of drastic cuts in our defence expenditure. Courage in one form or another, but distinguished from old Micawber's confidence, is called for to meet the crisis which cannot any longer be hidden or ignored. The best form of courage in the present context is to face the anti-Pakistani fanatics and follow the only rational course indicated and make drastic savings in the military budget.

The idea of meeting the situation by entering into long-term commitments with the 'Free World' in the form of loans is bound to land us in political implications that must surely affect our independence in international affairs. It is treacherous ground to walk on. The right solution is one that can be executed by ourselves, although it certainly requires great strength of decision. Nothing short of an intrepid move can adequately meet the situation.

Many factors have contributed to the remarkable economic revival of Germany and Japan after the almost wholesale devastation of the war. But the fact that these nations have reduced their military expenditure, whether the reduction be by inclination or necessity, is one of the chief contributing causes. The present prosperity of Germany and Japan must inspire us in India as well as in Pakistan not only to fresh energy but to a realization of the wastefulness of putting money in armaments in the context of the present world.

August 23, 1958 *Swarajya*

GOOD LITERATURE

At the outset let me make it clear that though I propose talking about books, this is not a review. It is just a reverie, mere meditation with the books mentioned as starting point for thought.

The editor of *Swarajya* lent me a book of good old Leo Tolstoi's short stories translated from the Russian and beautifully printed by the Foreign Languages Publishing House of Moscow. I began reading it with avidity, for one can never tire of Tolstoi. During the same week another friend lent me to read an American book, the short stories of Dorothy Parker—also very beautifully got up as it deserved to be.

Both the books I read together, that is to say, a story from one book now, and a story from the other another time, and again from the American book and back again from Tolstoi, and so on. I finished reading both quick enough, and now this reverie. A contrast of impressions thus accidentally and irrelevantly formed in my mind.

You rise from Dorothy Parker with repulsion in your thoughts about the drunkenness and the filthy adulteries of the rich women of America. It is too bad for words. One would not have believed it but for the fact that a high class American authoress has written it. There is no doubt she is a powerful writer fired to indignation, who lays it on mercilessly—chastising the wicked and the drunken not with whips but with scorpions. This fine American writer reminds one of Dickens and others who wrote 'with a finger of power upon hearts' about the vices that prevailed in Britain. But they had not the inimitable irony and subtlety of the American authoress.

From Tolstoi, whatever story you read, you rise with an elevation of spirit and a sense of deep fulfilment. You walk with God wherever the Russian sage takes you in his quiet noiseless way warning you against sin and against the deadly error of self-pity. The scene in Dorothy Parker's stories is a wilderness of wickedness deserted by God once and for all. Why is the America of Dorothy Parker this, why is Tolstoi's Russia this other? Is it indeed that the wealth of America is a curse, and the trials of poverty to which the Russian people were subjected served but to strengthen them and to fulfil the high purpose of Providence? Whereas in Dorothy Parker's America God has become a pander, a superintendent of vulgarity and vice, the loathsomeness of which has compelled Him to give up the job altogether, in Tolstoi we find trial after trial leaving the sufferers stronger and yet stronger in their faith.

Dorothy Parker's talent for telling the story of a soul's torment from just one end of a mere telephone, and the subtlety that she wields in expressing tragedy taking the reader also into a kind of active co-operation, is unique.

But what genius produces for one country may not be good fare for another country. We are apt, in India, to take it that Dorothy Parker's America is the whole of America which would be altogether untrue. We cannot afford international appraisements to go so recklessly wrong.

Let us read good books. What are good books and what are useless? After reading a good book you always rise with an elevation of spirit. You say to yourself 'I shall be brave, I shall be frank, I shall be good, I shall be better than I have been.' The other kind of book may please, it may be interesting, bright; but you do not rise from it a better man or woman after reading it. It has consumed a part, an irrecoverable part of your life but has given you nothing in return. Dorothy Parker, Americans should read and cry in pain and get better.

But for India, it is no good book unless you wish to learn to despise America, which would not be right or good. But Tolstoi cannot be read too often by us in India, to be saved from irredeemable error and to hold on to fundamental good.

Art and literature need not always have a didactic purpose. Indeed direct didacticism is far from art. Every noble piece of art or literature must waft on the reader's soul a healthy breeze like the breeze of the heavens and cleanse it of ugliness and evil. The moral or purpose should be "wrought into the body and soul, the matter and tendency of the story or the poem, not tagged to the end like a 'God send the good ship into harbour' at the conclusion of our bills of lading," as Charles Lamb put it.

August 30, 1958 *Swarajya*

A THREAT TO UNITY

Unlike Belshazzar in his hall
He spurns the writing on the wall.

— Reginald Reynolds

The linguistic isolationism that has risen like an evil spirit from the States reorganization cauldron will surely result in the break up of India into islands, with no means of co-ordination, co-operation or even communication, if English be thrust out of the secretariats, the universities and the courts. To keep English in the press while dethroning it in the secretariat would be a stultification and an absurd contradiction. To hope that the Hindi press will serve the purpose would be too absurd a hallucination even for the fanatics. The writing on the wall is

clear enough without a Daniel being asked to read it. The evil will have firmly established itself if we depend on baby Hindi to grow and fight, and fill the gap.

It is obvious folly to give up the string that binds, as a result of a hundred and more years of history, education, and legal and administrative development.

English must not only be retained if we desire to maintain Indian unity against the centrifugal linguistic fanaticism which is enveloping every field of activity, educational and political, but also greatly strengthened in the educational field. Every observer has noticed and remarked about the deterioration in the English standard in schools and colleges. This must be immediately attended to. The fallacy that attention to one's mother-tongue must be accompanied by a neglect of English must be effectively demolished. The greater fallacy that attention to English is a favour done to England should be exposed and removed. The notion that it is patriotic to neglect English must be countered. While it is true that education must be through the mother-tongue, it does not follow that worthless translations of text-books of modern knowledge should be prescribed in place of standard English books. If English as a language subject must remain in the curriculum, there is no earthly reason why the good text-book should not continue and furnish exercise in the use of English while the explanations in the classroom are given in the regional language. The students must be drilled indirectly in the handling of English by means of this wise combination of good English text-books written by eminent English authors along with teaching through the mother-tongue. It is well known that the translations made to order are less intelligible than the original English books, and often full of errors and defects. The love of one's own language and the application of it to modern subjects should not lead to perversion of knowledge at the source. There is no contradiction or disadvantage in the text-books functioning side by side with oral lectures and explanations in the regional language.

The teaching of English should also be changed as far as possible into the 'direct' method through exercises, both oral and written, in the English classes on subjects handled in the other classes. English should not be sought to be taught in the air, so to say, but with reference to the knowledge obtained in other fields of study.

The choice of books prescribed for attaining proficiency in English should also be more sensible. A recent letter that appeared in the columns of *Swarajya* about a condensed and edited *Quentin Durward* should serve as an eye-opener. There is a growing racket in the text-books business that should be firmly handled by enlightened men of integrity before it gets too deeply entrenched in politics like the sister racket in admissions to colleges. Good text-books are the basis of the language education and the abomination of notes and synopses, the very enemy of ducation.

September 6, 1958 *Swarajya*

THIS CLIMATE OF GREED

THOSE who are old enough may recall the days immediately following the First World War when India was stirred to heroism in her struggle for Freedom. Not only Gandhi and Shaukat Ali but thousands of lesser men drew moral energy from the conviction that God had chosen them to serve the nation. After the attainment of political freedom this conviction quickly faded away. All the diseases of the old Indian Adam—timidity, snobbery, greed, worship of power have returned—returned double-fold and attained a peak higher than ever before since the tenth century A.D.

In economic and political reflections we come ever and again across references to 'our rulers' as when the British Secretary

NON-RECOGNITION OF CHINA

In spite of every common sense consideration, an unseen force appears to be leading the United States to war-mentality. There is a great tide of Winston Churchill-worship rising in that country now. It is an ominous sign that indicates a landslide of thoughts towards desperation and war. I hope it is only my own gloom and not any bad turn in American psychology that makes me see dark clouds.

Was it for the preservation of peace that the American and British troops landed in Lebanon and Jordan? *The New York Times*'s front page analysis (Aug. 17) frankly puts down the motive in unambiguous and different terms: "It was the desire to forestall total collapse of the Western position in the Middle East that brought about the dispatch of American troops to Lebanon and British troops to Jordan last month." So it is 'Western position' and not Peace that had to be defended or invitations that *had* to be complied with. The troops are still there and the troops cannot and will not help the 'Western position'.

The Formosa situation has developed into threatening dynamism. We must deem contracts sacred and it is worth while keeping them rather than too easily breaking them. But how long must an anomalous fiction of a non-existent Chinese State be kept up as against the factuality of communist China? The mass is too big to be ignored or to be casuisted about. Can a mere paid soldiery be a nation with which the U.S.A. is to be for all time tied up as against a nation-State of 500 millions who can never be expected to give up her natural claim to Formosa as an integral part of China? Formosa is a cantonment and a military provocation, pure and simple, without a

nation behind it. The whole world has accepted China but America still believes in shutting her eyes to it, and wasting money on keeping a nationless State as a permanent potential sign of war in front of China.

And now things are shaping from potential to kinetic condition. The power-calculators may have found an agreeable balance in favour of America and advised a push, but the world knows the inevitable meaning of it foretold by atomic scientists and psychology experts. 'Tactical' is bound to end in something that is not wanted. If America must respect her promises to Chiang Kai-shek, Russia must also be expected to keep her faith with China. And then nuclear war will solve all the minor problems of the world that have refused so far to yield to the treatment of minor marine landings and naval manoeuvres !

Since writing the foregoing, the papers have brought news of Russia's warning to the U.S., and this time we cannot ignore the 'cry of wolf' :

PORTLAND (Oregon), Sept. 5

> Democratic Senator Wayne Morse last night called for a special emergency session of Congress 'to check both President Eisenhower and Dulles in the exercise of their foreign policy of brinkmanship.'

LONDON, Sept. 6

> Moscow Radio, to-day, broadcast another declaration of the Soviet Union's solidarity with Communist China in opposing the new military adventure which it said the United States was preparing against China in the Formosa area

September 13, 1958 *Swarajya*

TIME TO CRY HALT

THE American and British troops are still in Lebanon and Jordan. They were sent there, we are told, to safeguard the Western position in Middle East.

What is the Western position? It can mean only one thing in modern times—friendship—friendship of the people, not of a temporary administration or ruler on the throne. These Western troops are expending and rapidly consuming the 'Western position' in this sense of that elusive phrase. They are not earning friendship but increasing the prejudice of the people against the West. And prejudice easily develops into the opposite of friendship. Very little is needed to speed up that process.

Bullying is not the way to earn Western position. It is not in order, in modern political life, in Asia any more than in the West. The result of bullying is the opposite of what is intended. It would be good policy for these tourists in the Levant to end their unproductive holiday and depart unobserved while the eyes of the world are on Quemoy, watching brinkmanship in the Far East with anxiety and fear.

The President of the United States has spoken again reiterating that the 'Republic of China' and the lawful government of that vast nation reside in Formosa and not in China. Solemnly he closes his eyes against the existence of so real and so massive a fact as China. How can a policy be wise or work out for the good of anybody, when it is built on the foundation of a mere illusion, a wish mistaken for fact? We are told that if Quemoy be permitted to go over, then the enemy would take Formosa, and then spread out to Japan, and so the whole of Asia would be theirs. If this be true, China's existence

itself is a threat and co-existence is impossible. We go back to Hitler who shrieked that the Bolsheviks must be 'liquidated'. Are we to try it again?

No, not liquidation but co-existence must be tried and tried normally—without pin-pricks and provocations, without Formosa and Chiang Kai-shek. I have no doubt there are wise men in America who see all this. It is their patriotic duty to rise and bring a halt to wrong policy, both in the nearer East and the Far East and restore America's dignity and spiritual leadership.

September 20, 1958 *Swarajya*

FAIRY TALE FIGURES

Mr. Maganbhai P. Desai has written a letter to important newspapers and published his statistical conclusion that literacy in Hindi is many times greater than literacy in English in South India, in Madras State and in Madras City. I could not believe my eyes reading this.

And now Mr. Datar, the energetic colleague of the Home Minister of India, has come out with a fairy tale of 50 lakhs of South Indian Hindi literates, leaving English far, far behind!

Mr. Subbiah of the Tamil Academy has explored the mystery and sent a report which explains the false basis of this cloud-castle built for the pleasure of Hindi fanatics. A statistical form has been given to what cannot but be called an untruth. We cannot get figures of efficient literacy—or any kind of literacy for that matter—and work out percentages by *adding up* the number of candidates appearing in *successive* years for the Hindi Prachar examinations. And some of these

examinations do not come up to the English standard of the lowest forms of our schools. As for Mr. Datar's figure, not even all the figures in the Prachar Sabha's tables blindly totalled up yield this fairy tale figure !

The official report about the circulation of English language papers in all India must be a great blow to the protagonists of Hindi. Ten lakhs circulation of English dailies as against less than four lakhs circulation of Hindi dailies in all India proves what is the inter-lingua of India. If the Hindi and English circulation of papers in South India could be got at, the result would be a knock-out blow to demonstrate the microscopic status of Hindi in South India as against English.

Whatever be the merits of the case for Hindi, let it not be based on *factual* claims which every schoolboy in South India would know to be false. Proving the impossible is not good policy.

September 20, 1958 *Swarajya*

INFERIORITY COMPLEX

A news item from Washington (appearing in the papers on September 25) stated that " the United States did not intend to recognize the provisional Algerian regime proclaimed in Cairo a few days ago ". Did anyone expect anything else ? The United States Government has not 'recognized' the *de facto* Chinese Government functioning before the eyes of the whole world in China for a decade and having its seat in Peking in China and its representatives functioning as ambassadors in some of the biggest capitals of the world. And the Government of the United States refuses to accept the advice of even allies and recognizes an imaginary government of China sitting outside

China with American props and training its borrowed guns on the motherland. This is grim humour. The rest of the world looks upon it as a tragedy. America objects to force being used by China to recover the islands of China but forgets that it is naked American force that has so far separated them from China.

Tragedy or burlesque, this would not have mattered, if the peace of the world were not gravely endangered by this persistent attachment to unreality. A metaphysician who does not recognize the evidence of his senses is no danger, as long as he confines his thoughts to his library, but if he goes about in the streets of the world brandishing and distributing deadly arms, reasonable people give another name to the philosopher and arrange to restrain him.

There is an assumption—which is half expressed and half unexpressed—that intervenes in a subtle manner to mould policy in America, and perhaps generally in the West, that communism is beyond the pale of law and that, whatever morality restricts action in other cases, is not to be followed in dealing with a powerful communist State or in dealing with any country which is exposed to communist influence. It is this that blinds U.S. politicians to the rights and wrongs of the Chinese islands and the Formosa issue. Nye Bevan has recently written in the columns of *The Daily Herald* exposing the utter untenability of the American position in regard to China and its claims to a seat in the U.N., and to the undisturbed possession of the off-shore islands and of Formosa.

These views of the Labour leader are shared by a large number of British people who are not partisans of the Labour Party. But governments these days are independent of the opinion of their people in regard to foreign affairs and are governed more by extraneous forces than by internal public opinion. He has exposed the fallacy of objecting to Chinese force' to recover the islands, when the separation of these from

the Government of China is itself the result of the continued application of force of arms supplied from abroad by a foreign nation to a discredited ex-dictator, on the strength of an outdated treaty with a China that is no longer existing. Pulling in various and contrary directions, the urge in those who have a sabre to rattle, the fear of being thought to be really unwilling to venture, genuine hesitation to precipitate world disaster, the fear that hesitation may be mistaken for weakness, the dread of being thought and spoken about as following a policy of 'appeasement', a mounting and irresistible inclination to terminate tension by bursting into action, the knowledge that such action must lead to retaliation and total disaster, all these alternately influence either party in the cold war backwards and forwards, but in the sum bring calamity nearer and nearer to the world each day. There is no greater danger to world peace today than the fear of being thought to seek peace. A terrible inferiority complex has seized great America. May her wiser statesmen soon deliver her from this ! And may the warring Powers soon turn their thoughts to the abjuring of the use of all nuclear weapons, big and small, that mankind may be saved from unforeseen and multiplying troubles !

October 4, 1958 *Swarajya*

BEST AVAILABLE MEDIUM

Untruth never helped man or party or nation. And it is most unfair to use it against those whom you claim to be your own flesh and blood. Do not argue on false data, be it a matter of literacy-percentages or adequacy of vocabulary or the Southerners' ability to learn your language, or any other thing of that kind. Stick to the real points in your favour and win or lose on them.

What are the points urged in favour of Hindi ?

One: It would make for identity between the language of official life and that of the people.

Two: English is a foreigner's language and we should have pride enough to get on with one of our own languages instead of retaining a stranger's language for official work.

Three: Hindi is spoken by a very large population and the rest of the people may be coaxed or compelled to get acquainted with it.

Now these are the only legitimate reasons, adequate or not, that can be urged; and Hindi-speaking friends should hear the other side on these points, and hear with an open and friendly mind casting off all the bias born of self-interest and also pride of power given by numerical democracy and the constitutional provision adopted in 1950, which is law not of the Medes and Persians but is open to amendment or repeal.

Hindi is the language of the people of only a certain part of India and that is not even the larger part. The identity of the medium of administration with the language of the people will be attained only in that area which is limited by definite boundaries. In the rest of India the people do not speak Hindi, and the identity claimed cannot be attained by the adoption of Hindi. The Government of India must be evenly related to the *whole* of India. Official life at effective levels in more than half of the reorganized States of India will find Hindi stranger than English. If Hindi is made the Union official language, the people of the South will not see identity of language between them and the Government, but the domination of a language that is not theirs by birth or by education and which gives to a section of the people of India the position of a ruling race.

English is no doubt the language of the foreigner who ruled India till recently. But must we harbour a feeling of hatred in respect of his language? Should we not examine

the position without prejudice, having convenience and general advantage in view?

English has rooted itself in all the branches of administration that make up modern India and distinguish her from the past. The pains and the inconveniences of a change are too great to be overlooked and the inevitable damage consequent on change would be great.

English would kill two birds with one stone, being the best available medium for foreign relations as well as for inter-State and Union official work in internal affairs. This aspect has a bearing on the education programme of the nation and even distribution of burdens in that respect between the North and the South.

What is the real element in a foreign tongue to which we ought to object? Its strangeness, not anything else. English is not now a stranger in India by any means. On the other hand, Hindi is a complete stranger to the people of over half of India divided off by definite boundary from the Hindi area. To a substantial and not inconsequential part of India in the South, English is not a tenth as foreign as Hindi, in view of our history during the last 200 years.

Pride has never led to truth. The question of the administration of the Union, and in what language it should be conducted, ought not to be settled on the basis of pride, when it works disadvantage to large parts of India and unearned advantage to certain other parts. Hindi is *not* easy to learn for the people of the South and the burden would be too great in the educational curriculum if we remember the other essential elements that must necessarily be covered, including a pretty high grade English.

There would be manifest discrimination in favour of the people whose mother-tongue is Hindi. The latter's educational

curriculum would be much lighter than that which must be forced on the boys and girls of the South. We assume that all boys and girls, wherever they be, are ambitious. English cannot be avoided by the acceptance of Hindi at the Union level. This is admitted. The needs of modern progressive life and the part that government must play in that field compel the retention of the study of English. Indeed, it is admitted that more attention should be given to English than has been given in the recent past. All university authorities have said this. Keeping in view all the arguments advanced, the case against Hindi taking the place of English becomes stronger. The burden to be carried by the boys and girls of the South, who would have to learn both English and Hindi, will greatly exceed that which those of the Hindi area will have to bear. This issues from the proposal that the mother-tongue of the latter should become the Union official medium. The people of the South have a right to ask for the continuance of English as the best solution for progress.

The people speaking other languages than Hindi are never going to adopt Hindi in place of their own mother-tongues. If the movement for making Hindi the Union official language is based on a vague feeling that Hindi will one day become the national language of all India, it is based on a foundation that is not true, on a hope that cannot be fulfilled and which would be resisted and opposed if expressed.

There cannot be ever a single national language for India. The time is past for the achievement of such an object. We are many centuries too late for it. Each one of the languages in India claims a rich and growing literature and has vigour and beauty, and enough of every element to infuse equal pride. We have missed the bus for making a single national language. What could have been done by compulsion and influence of all sorts fifteen centuries ago cannot be done now. All that we can have is an efficient *official* language, equally convenient for all parts of India which have all a right to share in the proper

administration of the Union. English has been serving as an efficient official language, and Hindi has not the elements that make equal convenience for all parts of India, not to speak of efficiency or precision. Let no one imagine, or seek to refute a claim that is not made, that anyone wants English to be made the *national* language of India. It is just a convenient instrument for the particular purpose, viz., of official work, and no emotional appeal to pride has any relevancy. The one and only, as well as great, national inheritance by way of language and literature is Sanskrit and the proper encouragement of that language as well as English would not only be welcomed by all parts of India but help a spiritual movement that would halt the deterioration of moral values that has become the greatest obstacle in the way of the speedy progress of modern India.

If the Hindi proposition is not merely to be a pin-prick programme, but a plan to take the full place of English, what will result from yielding to it is the destruction of such unity as we now have and the breaking of such links as we now have between State and State, and between India and the outer world. It would be suicidal and mean the sacrifice of internal unity as well as of our effective voice in the counsels of the world.

The issue should be left by us to posterity who will be in a better position to judge. The truest basis of national policy is justice. Individual views of what is beneficial may often be wrong. But injustice is patent and the avoidance of it is a duty. The adoption of Hindi by force of parliamentary majority as the Union official language and the inter-lingua of the States would be an act of injustice to all those to whom Hindi is a new and strange medium difficult for them to learn, and impossible to attain proficiency in, for positive use. Five generations of life under British administration has left a result which cannot be ignored. The continuance of English would be justice done to all, whereas the imposition of Hindi would be manifestly unfair to a very large section of the nation. It is perilous

for rulers to overlook the principle of justice, where they seek to rule by love and not by the sword.

October 5, 1958 *Link*

THE FILLING IN THE PIE

JUST as the housewife puts the *poornam* on the prepared flour and makes it into a complete and sweet *modakam,* or a savoury *kachauri,* so *aatman* fills the *sareeram* and makes it a person.

So again, says the Acharya, the individual *aatman* becomes what it is, by being filled with the *poornam* that issues out of the one and only *poornam,* God.

Without the *aatman,* the *sareeram* is but an inert mass. So also the individual *aatman* would be an inert nothing without the *antaraatman,* which is God. The one and only *poornam,* that which fills and completes everything is God, without which it would be *modakam* without *poornam.*

Every being around you is filled with that *poornam.* You have Him everywhere, there at a distance, and here in yourself. Far and near is God—everywhere. Everything has issued out of Him : *poornaat* — from God, *poornam* — everything, *udachyate* — has issued.

That there, is *poornam,* God !
Here this, is *poornam* God !

पूर्णमदः पूर्णमिदं पूर्णात्पूर्णमुदच्यते ।

This is the first line of an Upanishad *saanti* mantra, that is, an invocation for peace of mind. The second line takes us to

the great conclusion that God informs every being that we see and therefore everything partakes of the Divine.

Look upon every being as the same with you, and all as divine.

पूर्णस्य पूर्णमादाय पूर्णमेवावशिष्यते ।

The divine essence informs every being; for has not every being issued from Him? How can the quality of the source fail to be the quality of what issued from it? Look upon all beings, then, as divine and filled with the all-filling *poornam*. *Poornam* in the Upanishad mantra means the whole, or all, as well as what makes a thing complete as the *poornam* completes the *modakam* and makes it what it is.

So the *Isaavaasya* Upanishad Rshi says :

यस्तु सर्वाणि भूतान्यात्मन्येवानुपश्यति ।
सर्वभूतेषु चात्मानं ततो न विजुगुप्सते ॥

He who habitually sees lives as if resting and moving in his own body and sees himself as functioning in the bodies of all beings, and thus feels one with all beings around—such a person has no aversion or fear of anything. This constant practice of compassion leads to identity :

यस्मिन्सर्वाणि भूतान्यात्मैवाभूद्विजानतः ।
तत्र को मोहः कः शोक एकत्वमनुपश्यतः ॥

When one has attained knowledge and realized all beings as himself and everything has therefore become himself, there is no grief or delusion for such a one. He is emancipated.

The meaning usually given to this *saanti sloka* is this : The whole is God; from Him Who is whole has issued all this whole; yet He remains whole—making the mantram an exposition of the relationship between God and soul, of the mathematical properties of infinity, that when it is subtracted from, it still remains infinite. The interpretation I have sought to give

makes it a part of the Yoga preached in the *Gita* and particularly *Gita* Ch. IV. 35, Ch. V. 7 and Ch. VI. 29 as well as *slokas* 6 and 7 of the *Isopanishad* itself.

October 11, 1958 *Swarajya*

PAKISTAN

CORRUPTION and misgovernment bring about a volume of discontent among the masses which opens out a passage for ambitions and conspiracies. It is difficult to say whether in a given situation personal ambitions came into being after the discontent attained an intolerable volume or whether they preceded it and only awaited an opportunity. Often the persons fired by ambition are themselves unable to perceive the sequence. So complex is the human mind that it not seldom deceives itself into confounding a justification for a motivating cause, and other people have no time for analysis. The fast-moving events carry them forward, leaving no time or power for judgment .

Mirza of Pakistan has declaimed against corruption and conspiracy and set out an eloquent preface to the abrogation of democracy. The contents of this preface, far from exciting any satisfaction in India as may have been expected by superficial observers, serve, on the contrary, to alarm and dishearten. There is wisdom enough here to realize that whatever has happened in Pakistan can happen in India also.

It is difficult to say whether the Pakistan President found an instrument in the army for a previous decision on the very good grounds stated in the proclamation, or whether he became the tool and mouthpiece of the ambitions of the leaders of the army. What has been stated serves to appease popular disapproval.

An eminent modern historian has, after analysing and examining all probable causes for the downfall of the Roman Empire, given first place to the absence of a good citizen army to balance the power of the professional armies that served the Empire. We in India as well as in Pakistan have spent money, resources and credit over building up a powerful military machine which is certainly better organized than any political party, including the ruling party in office. Personal ambition is an elemental force which waits only for an opportunity successfully to tempt the human mind. The hypnosis of military life is enough to give to generals of the army the same power as political leaders have over their party. The army in Pakistan differs in composition from the army in India. But the differences, while they are a cause for reduced power, are also causes that militate against the unity of India even through fascism. It would be double misfortune if democracy should be replaced not by a unitary fascist rule, but the country is divided and ruled by several disunited factions of military power. These and other thoughts issuing therefrom are dangerous even to contemplate and describe. But they should not be ignored although we might not, for that reason, fill up the picture.

Good government is the only safeguard that we can set up against an attack on democracy by the very machinery that we have set up for the defence of the country against external dangers. For good government we require a properly recruited administrative staff whose members refuse to swerve from their proper duties at the instance of party politicians and the numerous crowd of parasites surrounding the party leaders. We require, further, men in the ruling party who do not mistake party for country and who know the limitations that should prevail and guide every policy, however good.

Those who strive for a single goal at the cost of all others are fanatics, and an attitude of that kind makes government go wrong. Human goals are so related to each other that the

defeat or frustration of the other makes the original goal impossible of achievement or it transforms its very quality, making what was good into something bad.

Statesmanship consists in the ability to achieve changes that are necessary without frightening society or important sections of it. A party is put in office by reason of confidence in the leaders of that party. These should be guided not merely by a desire to keep the party contented and strong, but by the requirements of society for changes which stability itself calls for in changing times. But there is a tendency to overdo this and things are done so as to frighten the affected people. The true function of the Opposition is to prevent this error by force of debate, and its constant challenge to replace government. In India such an Opposition has not yet come into being. The danger thus is great of error over-reaching good policy.

Apart from government and political wisdom, we have the great problem of improving the level of character among people generally, which has a continuous effect for good or evil on the character of the members of the administrative staff and the ministers. We want a discipline that must fill the place of religion which, alas, has lost much ground. We want right conduct to become a thing of habit. The difficulty in conduct, it has been pointed out long ago, does not lie in not knowing what it is right to do but in doing it when known. Repetition of moral rules will not therefore serve. The Will must be trained to obey Conscience. Secular culture and what is called 'moral instruction' do not touch the conscience which must be strengthened so as to be able to overcome wrong desire. Intellectual culture does not provide motives which can overcome the weakness of the Will. On the other hand, it brings new temptations. We cannot therefore be sure that we have done the right thing in declaring a negative war of blockade against all religions in our anxiety to avoid conflict. We must let all religions flourish and function. Therein only lies hope for democracy to hold its own against its own internal enemies

and the dangers of the organized strength of its own tools of defence against external danger.

October 18, 1958 *Swarajya*

PAKISTAN PORTENT

STANDING armies have ever been looked upon by democracies as a source of danger. Like cancer cells, these elements intended for protection against external danger, grow and get out of hand and become a fatal enemy of the organism itself. It is only when a community is in a perfectly healthy, virile condition that it can control its army. Where this condition fails, the army, which by its very nature has grown into a well-knit and disciplined force, asserts itself and takes over the function of government instead of being the mere physical arm of the community.

It is another instance of nature abhorring a vacuum. Where there is no good government for the people, issuing from out of their own representatives, the army fills the place. This has happened in Pakistan, near enough for us to perceive (without being lectured to) the certainty that unless we improve in character we shall get ruled by the strong and well disciplined body of men accustomed to obey their chiefs, which we have set up with our resources, money and credit for a different purpose.

The problem is not how to curb the strength of standing armies; for that is inconsistent with present day doctrines of international politics, and will continue to be so until we attain the courage required for a pacifist foreign policy. The problem is how to develop a healthy defence against such ambitions and potential dangers as are inherent in the maintenance of a

large and well-organized standing army. The defence against, and the only check on, such untoward developments as have happened before our eyes in other countries including Pakistan is in the development of courage in the civil population, in the maintenance (perhaps we should say restoration) of character and healthy moral and spritual standards in the daily life of the people, and honesty and efficiency in the official world, especially where that particular world comes in contact with the rest of the community in its daily affairs.

Can we raise the moral level of daily conduct by secular homilies? It is not because people do not *see* what is right and what is wrong that they do not observe the moral codes. It is because the Will is not strong enough to reject temptation and listen to the voice of Conscience. How is the Will to be strengthened? It cannot be done and has not been done in history except by one or the other of two conditions. The atmosphere created by a revolution raises terror all round along with hope, and this achieves a moral chastening. During other periods of quiet, such as follow a revolution, it can be achieved only through religion : not this or that religion, but by some one or other religion which creates a religious spirit and strengthens the Will to do the right and to reject the attractions of evil.

Intellectual advancement has produced new attractions and new desires instead of furnishing the Will with greater strength, the net result being that probably the uneducated are better men and women than the educated ! The secularity of our Government has been no doubt enunciated and adopted by reason of the overriding requirement of impartiality in this land of many religions and denominations. The State must abstain from imposing the particular doctrines or forms and rituals of any single religion or denomination upon others, if for no other reason, for maintaining national harmony, but this attitude of negative impartiality is not enough to meet the requirements of the fast deteriorating situation. The modern

entertainment-arts have added to the velocity of the regression of morality. The Will to resist evil is daily being enfeebled by these arts. Even if we cannot stop this inroad of the modern entertainment programmes, we may and should find means to encourage and help all those religions that command authority and reverence in Indian family life. This alone can furnish concrete strength to that abstract awe and that reverent attitude to the mystery of the universe which form the essence of all religions. A mere recognition of this common element of all religions does not by itself become a religion capable of sustaining the Will to Right. It is not enough, at least for the vast majority of people who have inherited various traditions and forms of worship. Something more positive is needed to sustain culture, restraint, spiritual values and good conduct. Without culture, restraint and good conduct, 'progress' will not be 'progress' and democracy must crumble down one day and make way for a violent order of civil government.

October 19, 1958 *Link*

CALL FOR UNILATERAL ACTION

When are a people civilized? What are the essential characteristics of a civilized nation? And when can the world which is the larger community be said to have attained civilization?

It is true that a certain degree of material comfort is essential for civilization; but civilization does not consist in an ever-increasing degree and number of material comforts, the pursuit of which is made the object of life. Idleness is not civilization. Nor is an unbroken hunt for sensuous enjoyment, civilization. It leads to a general condition of society that takes it farther and farther away from civilization.

A community is civilized when its members do not feel the need for physical protection against one another. This is attained when men and women do not covet one another's possessions or the means of happiness they command,—when they do not fear one another and therefore do not require to be always prepared to defend themselves against the encroachments of fellow-citizens. A people carrying weapons for self-defence is not a civilized community. The need to be armed proves a state of fear and a condition of savagery. Being entirely free from the fear of being attacked, the members of a civilized community go about unarmed.

A state of mind free from fear of one another and taking good behaviour for granted can be brought about only by a general climate in which there is no envy or greed, and where men and women respect one another and treat one another's honour, peace and happiness as inviolable. Everyone in such a society works, realizing that that is the only way to live. Education, religion and philosophy must serve to bring about and maintain unbroken this prevalence of mutual respect, this climate of honest labour, and this freedom from envy and greed. An ever-rising standard of ease and comfort and an ever-increasing hunt for goods and riches obviously go to produce an opposite climate, and therefore to put off civilization. Yet that increasing hunt is deemed to be civilization itself! Whereas the truth is that it not only is *not* true civilization, but also prevents any progress towards it.

In a civilized country men and women walk about without weapons of defence in their waists. They cannot and do not hope to get the police to arrive at every point when a crime may be attempted; yet they venture out, just not thinking of any such event taking place and taking peace and good conduct for granted. Everything goes on smoothly. This condition of fearlessness and taking good conduct for granted is what is called civilization. Where this condition does not prevail, the people may be on the way to civilization but are not yet civilized.

What has been said above applies to world civilization too. But alas, the nations are still savages in their mutual affairs. They can hope one day to be civilized. But this can be realized only if they steadily progress in the art of living without coveting one another's possessions or achievements and shedding all fear of one another.

ईशावास्यमिदꣳ सर्वं

All things here have their being in God.

मा गृधः कस्यस्विद्धनम्

Do not covet what another possesses.

कुर्वन्नेवेह कर्माणि जिजीविषेच्छतं समाः ।

Work always, all your life of a hundred years.

एवं त्वयि नान्यथेतोऽस्ति

This and naught else is the way to live.

Till we reach the state thus described in the Upanishad mantra, we are not civilized. And when we reach that state we are truly civilized. It is only then we can shed all fear. As long as we thirst for what we do not have but which another has, we must live in fear of one another. And in that state of mind there can be no civilization. As long as we desire to be idle and to live without working we cannot but live a life of dependence and be occupied in ways and means of maintaining such a life which is bound with envy and fear. This is true of a single community and of the larger community called the world.

Who shall bring about this state of civilization in the world? That is to say, which people will set the example in this direction? There is no way of bringing about any good thing but by example. It may be, it is never possible to reach the ideal, and our human lot may only be to be ever moving

in that direction, fixing our eyes on that ever-receding point of glory. Which nation can set this example? Not certainly any of the nations whose every minute of existence is in fear of someone or other.

Who are the least afraid among the peoples of the world now? Whoever it be, it is these only that can lead and become the teachers of mankind,—not those that have the largest stock of munitions. The insatiable cry for security is a confession of insatiable fear, an admission that those are not the people that can lead mankind to civilization. If any people can make up their mind to live without thought of security, these may lead the world to true civilization. This is the argument behind the plea for unilateral disarmament. The demand for agreement and safeguards is a symptom of tentative wisdom but not of fearlessness. And it is fearlessness that is the essence of civilization.

What is of great importance is that we have reached such a pass that the alternative to 'not doing the right thing' is total wreckage of human life on this planet. It were tolerable if the only penalty for unwisdom was that we stayed where we were. But, alas, the alternative is dreadful!

How can we practise fearlessness and take peace for granted when we have obvious peace-breakers around us? This is the vicious circle that keeps fear going and civilization far off. There is no way of survival unless we break this vicious circle by a heroic undertaking of risk. India and Pakistan have a chance to lead the world. Their unfortunate differences can themselves become a great opportunity for exhibiting the fearlessness that alone, I have ventured to submit, is civilization. And if this be forthcoming, all the difficulties and trials of these two countries will have been a preparation for a great example, instead of being a mere misfortune.

October—December, 1958 *Quest*

INDO - PAK RELATIONS*

Out of the coup in Pakistan, not to refer to similar events in other parts of the East, two apprehensions issue as far as we in India are concerned. These two fears are distinct in character.

One is the fear that as a corollary of military usurpation and to divert public attention from that obvious wrong, a foreign adventure may be started by the Pakistan dictator and India may be its natural target.

The other fear is that the spirit of revolt may infect India, and democracy must be safeguarded with special care. On both these points, the Prime Minister has expressed his views and warnings in ample measure. He has advised the middle path of vigilance and calm : "Do not be complacent, but do not be worried either." The advice cannot be improved upon.

Yet I venture to say a few things in this connection which may supplement what has been hitherto said in public on the subject.

If we overdo the actual preparations for defence against a military attack—and there are enough people in India to support such a policy—we are likely to enter into a new phase of armament competition, which, apart from what it may do

---

* The Editor of *Indian Foreign Affairs* wrote a prefactory note : "The birth of military dictatorship in our neighbouring country, Pakistan, is indeed very disturbing and gives cause for serious concern to all those who believe in parliamentary democracy. In order to assess these happenings in their proper perspective, we invited the views of prominent Indian leaders on this question and are glad to present them in this section."

to Pakistan, will certainly ruin us. The situation in this respect stands further complicated by American (and perhaps all-West) silent help to Pakistan. The handicap in the race will be heavy against us and our further commitments with foreign Powers in order to equip ourselves on latest lines will increase our foreign obligations beyond the limit of tolerance. It would be indeed a death-trap. To yield to the cry of 'Arm against Pakistan' will certainly end in placing ourselves at the mercy of Western Powers and open a new chapter of colonialism which may be worse than the one that ended with the withdrawal of Britain from India.

It is easy enough to press the argument for vigilance and self-defence, with irrefutable logic to the point of a fierce race in armaments, which is sure to take us to utter ruin. It would be a fundamental error to give up the essential condition of sane co-existence, which is the discarding of fear and the development of mutual good relations and not to rely on equalizing belligerent preparations.

As regards the other apprehension, *viz.*, that democracy may be stabbed in India as in Pakistan, it should be less of a fear and more of a warning. Fear is bad in any form, but a warning is always good. It will lead to better realization of what should be done and what should not be done.

'Our country good or bad' holds the field in international affairs. 'Our party good or bad' holds the field in what is called parliamentary democracy. But Pakistan has demonstrated, in a most unexpected manner, for our benefit that people may not under *all* conditions stand up for democracy. Our claim has always been that the people of India and the people of Pakistan are very much the same, and that the 'two-nation theory' is totally baseless. If under some circumstances the people of Pakistan could without protest or trouble accept the rule of a military usurper and his junta, the people of India too may under those, or other circumstances, give up their faith in democracy.

It would be wrong to imagine that it is only when exactly the same conditions are reproduced here that danger to democracy can arise. Conditions different from what prevailed in Pakistan can yet be enough cause and come to prevail here which may produce the same result, *viz.*, an indifference to the form of government and a desire to have good government at all cost, and if necessary at the expense of democracy.

The warning of Pakistan to India is therefore that we should hasten to wipe out such abuses as have crept in on account of long single-party domination, and run government with less and less of party interest in view. We should quickly achieve the freedom of the administration from interference by party bosses and their under-bosses either in the interest of the party, or of particular party beneficiaries. The warning is that Government should be good in every way and efficient in all respects, and depend on that achievement for public approval more than on party votes. Stability depends more on good, honest and just administration than on the attraction of the ideal, the national participation in government by all citizens which is the supposed appeal of democracy. Indeed, citizens have in modern times a bias to be left alone rather than be responsible for government. What they want is that some people should undertake it who are steady, honest, just and efficient. The taking of too many tasks, either unnecessarily or prematurely, acts as a hindrance to good government. Window-dressing is good if we desire only a good name abroad. But a good reputation in the country itself is what is required most to prevent a mishap in India on the model of Pakistan. The Prime Minister's warning against complaisance should be extended in its application to failures and mistakes in the internal administration of the country. Indeed it is its most important meaning.

If we desire citizens to stand up in defence of a particular form of government, they should see with their own eyes its good points every day. They should see that it yields happiness at home, in the village and in the city. Glory secured by

'gigantism' (which is the Prime Minister's latest word for megalomania) is a mirage that deceives only those who are far off and not those who thirst for water. If, therfore, unfortunate Pakistan has suffered a military coup, it is a blessing for India, for there is nothing so good as a loud warning in time, next best to actual misfortune in our own person.

To ignore or write down this aspect of the situation and to beat the war-drum may be pleasant and easy. Far from being sound policy, it would be the worst thing that could happen to our policies.

What we should try to solve is the puzzle of Western indifference (or is it even satisfaction?) at what has happened. How is it that the Commonwealth is not shocked, by the illogicality of a military usurper in its fold? The 'flexibility' of the Commonwealth is indeed being over-demonstrated. It cannot only keep a republic in its fold with the British Crown above as a mere symbol of the over-all unity of the nations that the Commonwealth is composed of. It can even hold Ayub Khan and his naked usurpation. These are not just academic conundrums. It would be an intolerable entanglement if, on the one hand, we mess up our internal economy with loans from powerful foreign nations and, on the other hand, those same nations are determined to be stout allies of Pakistan and of its *de facto*, unparliamentary and autocratic Government. Neither the Commonwealth nor American ideology can long bear the strain of this strange patronage, and India will find herself in a hopeless tangle if she is a willing and consenting party to it. One wishes by some miracle of courage and re-adjustment we could dispense with 'aids' from abroad, which would give us full freedom of policy. This is not to be treated as mere criticism but as a suggestion to think out ways and means of escape from a position that threatens our freedom.

November 1958 *Indian Foreign Affairs*

PAKISTAN BELLIGERENCY

After throwing out Mr. Noon and his cabinet, after abrogating the Constitution and all democratic forms and assuming all power along with President Mirza, General Ayub has now thrown out Mirza also, and stands in solitary enjoyment of all authority.

He threatens India with war. This is probably the usual trick to get people to think and get mad over something else and thereby keep up his own illegitimate rule. If the war-mongering gets by the compulsion of slogans to become an actuality, General Ayub will be going the way of other war-mongering usurpers. We know where Hitler landed himself when he invaded Russia hoping to liquidate the Bolshevik military machine. It is, politically speaking, an attractive offer to fanatics. Young officers in the army, on whose support and enthusiasm the usurper's authority rests, may be deceived by this *ignis fatuus*. Religious fervour may be roused to take the shape of war. Throughout history fanatics never failed to ruin their nations. Some nations have survived the disaster. But not all.

No army in Pakistan, or anywhere in the world, can fulfil the ambitions of its officers without the readiness of the people to suffer, as the German people did under the misguidance of Hitler. This is the Achilles' heel of all military governments. General Ayub would do well, therefore, to consult his foreign friends as to the advisability of his anti-Indian military ambitions. Even if they, too, should encourage him for any reasons, or he draws a wrong meaning out of their equivocal advice and launch a military conflict, he will surely achieve the inglorious ruin of Pakistan. The people of Pakistan cannot go through what Germany went through, and survive.

Ayub will soon find that he is not treated by the U.S.A. with even that qualified respect which Chiang Kai-shek has been receiving in that quarter. Chiang had fought the communists

though without success. Ayub has done nothing of the kind. He has only deposed Noon and Mirza, which was not a herculean task as things stood !

For us in India, however, as a result of these happenings in Pakistan, there seems to be no escape from the disastrous evil of increasing military expenditure. Both Pakistan and India stand in imminent danger of being financially ruined in this way and once again demonstrating the vanity of human wishes, when based on external help.

If General Ayub does not make the mistake of overdoing his belligerency but contents himself with deceiving the people of Pakistan and maintaining order in Pakistan and holding the administration together, India would wish well to her neighbour State and watch with gratification any progress towards resumption of democratic government. The day may come, and nothing can be a greater joy than that Pakistan and India should both be efficienntly governed and be two friendly parliamentary democracies, and together be a glory to Asia and a bulwark for civilization.

November 8, 1958 *Swarajya*

COMPULSION IN AGRICULTURE

SOMETHING has gone wrong and our food production has become the most serious of our problems. It may appear to be too simple a prescription that I am giving, but I am convinced that it is the fundamental remedy for a fast deteriorating situation. The need of the hour is the restoration of contract to its old and legitimate place and the displacement of legislation which in recent times has, on the plea of public welfare, sought to occupy more and more of the place of contract.

Civilization marched from status to contract. Human life depends on mutual co-operation and this co-operation was mostly rendered in the old days on the basis of status, birth or rank in society. Later it came to be based on contract. Now, the State or the total power of society seeks to replace the contract basis and directly regulate all mutual services.

This finds specific illustration in the relationship between owner and cultivator in the field of agricultural productoin. The State in India, in the present phase, is eager to regulate the relationship among the men involved in the industry of food production, even before fully exploiting the potentialities of freedom of contract. An *ideal* State can of course do everything with the best possible results. But the unfortunate limitation of all governments is that the State is only as good or wise as those who make up the organization, be it a monarchy or an aristocracy or a bureaucracy or a democracy. Hence a premature replacement of contract by State regulation in agriculture may end in the terrible national calamity of mismanagement, lack of interest in production and shortage extending up to famine.

It makes little difference whether the master holds the slave or the slave holds the master. When the law gives rights irrespective of volition or agreement either to the master over the slave or, by way of retribution, to the slave over the previous master, it is slavery. If service is to be rendered under compulsion, in bodily labour or by placing accumulated resources at the disposal of one who did not build it up himself but who gets the advantage of it by legislation, it is equivalent to the status of slavery wherein the relationship between men is settled by legislation and not by contract.

It makes little difference from this point of view, if the landlord is made the legislative slave of the tenant, reversing the old position.

The human machinery of agriculture should be released from the stifling atmosphere of legislative compulsion. It is a remnant of olden days when government constantly sought to mitigate tribal and feudal tyranny. Services, be they of capital or skill or management or plain bodily labour, all must be reduced into the contractual framework which alone gives scope and dignity and satisfaction to the individual. The compulsive mechanism of legislation, often so faulty and so often changed from one policy to another according to the whims and interests of parties and powerful groups of politicians, must be terminated.

Custom ruled with holy authority when custom was sufficient to guide and restrain. It was not only obeyed but revered. It shaped the desires and activities of men. But now it stands wholly mauled. It has no longer enough life. Legislation seeks to take its place, but instead of the reverence that was custom's protection, we have political conflicts, machinations, electoral corruptions working around every legislation that seeks to govern production in the place of custom.

Legislation has definitely failed to achieve the social object in this field. What is needed now, and what will restore creativity and interest in agriculture, is restoration of the agricultural machinery of production to its proper contractual basis. Let everyone offer his services out of free will and enter into agreements and let contracts be invested with their old inviolability.

Let there be an end of the taking away of property from one and bestowing it on another for political strategy. It is cheap to continue in power by exploiting the legislative opportunity a party in office enjoys. The theory that economic stress robs men of real contractual freedom has been grossly overworked and has been kept alive beyond its time. It is called in to justify the dethronement of contract in favour of 'political legislation'. What is wanted is an all round revival

of the spirit of self-confidence and enterprise, as well as manly trust and friendliness. All this can be achieved and achieved only by ousting strategic legislation from the field of mutual service in agriculture and restoring contract to its legitimate place and authority.

On account of all that has happened in the brief interval of chaotic interference, the recall of legislation from its trespass may be attended with some difficulties, which however can only be transitory. The friction of a change-over may be reduced to the minimum, and this voluntary abdication of legislative agriculture can take place more quickly than may be anticipated. The result will be an abundant interest in the industry of agriculture, the only industry that can save India from its danger of famine and foreign debt and from the malady of chronic anxiety.

November 22, 1958 *Swarajya*

THE RIGHT TO STRIKE

> The best-laid schemes o'mice and men gang aft agley, no tellin' when.
>
> — Burns

'Mice' stands for the 'private sector' and 'men' of course for the 'public sector'. In a 'planned economy' how can we have labour strikes at the bidding of union leaders? And how can we at all allow 'sympathetic' strikes where nothing justifies the dislocation except the motive to show 'sympathy'? In an unplanned economy all this could be legitimate, even if unwise. But in a planned economy, it is altogether out of place—treason.

I am not a socialist or economist or any other 'ist. I do not say this in mock humility and as a claim to greater attention on that score. I simply can't understand planned economy along with the 'right to strike', and I confess it. In a State which has made up its mind really to run on socialist lines, the government must, it seems to me, control the greatest single element among all that go to make production, viz., man-power. The State must lay down the law and have no qualms. If it gives a free hand only to labour, but clamps down laws and rigid regulations on every other element that goes into the task of production or service, it is just union-o-cracy and not socialism or democracy.

Has government cared to direct its expert mind to the facts and figures of unemployment in India, not only the unemployment of expectant workers that have congregated in slums in cities, but of the vast uncountable unemployment of 'unskilled' men in the rural areas although in the census they are marked 'agriculture'? Is it socialism or welfare to allow the few employed industrial workers to close the avenues of employment against the poor and terribly distressed people that are prepared to do honest work for some wage, even if it be below the trade union level?

It is not welfare, it appears to me, to legislate and govern so as to keep up a standard of payment, when ten living souls have to get nothing, as against one that gets the benefit of that standard. Wage standard is an idea, whereas the men and women are live souls. What is the sense in saving a standard when men and women starve in the countryside?

The right to work according to a contract, accepted on either side, is a right stated to be guaranteed by the Constitution in Article 19. But this right is daily infringed at the altar of the so-called right to strike, which is sought to include also a right to prevent any others from working when a strike is declared by a trade union.

Apart from the conflict of rights, the freedom of labour to strike is inconsistent with the logic of a planned economy, in the private sector as well as in the nationalized industries. The success of Russia in emerging from poverty into wealth, notwithstanding its large population and the ignorance of its people, the phenomenal industry of Japan in the pre-war period as well as its latest resounding success in rising from the ashes of war destruction, must teach us valuable lessons as to the importance of utilising the man-power of the State to its fullest capacity without letting trade unionism to receive all the tenderness of the government to the point of national resources being wasted.

I have dealt only with a single issue, as it is of great importance in the context of the national effort, although there is a great deal to be discussed in respect of other matters and priorities. The right to strike and the freedom with which this right is exercised can make the 'best-laid schemes of mice and men gang aft agley, no telling when'. ('Gang agley' is Scotch for 'go wrong'.)

It is not as if when and if the right to strike is taken away from trade union leaders and the workmen under their discipline, the latter's just claims and wrongs done to them will go unattended to and unrectified. A State that has taken over charge of the welfare of the people as a whole, and all the powers corollary to it, has scope and authority enough to see that justice is rendered and wrongs remedied without having to make the community suffer the ill-effects of industrial dislocation. There are enough sanctions and procedures to meet every case as well as any strike can do it.

Strikes had to be resorted to in the days when they were conceived first, because there were no other ways and means to settle disputes. Governments then kept rigorously away from entering on the scene, whereas now the opposite is the case. The need for calling in the weapon of strikes has wholly

disappeared, yet by a sort of tradition and for the purpose of over-ruling the decisions of statutory tribunals, this unsocial weapon is resorted to. The plea made here for ending the anachronism is not intended to curtail the right of workers to obtain justice. It is a plea that justice should be made available without dislocating industry. The general effect of this anachronistic 'right' in the private sector is to frighten enterprise and investment. As for the public sector, the exercise of this right leads slowly but steadily and surely to the weakening of the authority of government, the strengthening of subversive elements and generally to a slant towards chaos. The right to strike is out of place in a Welfare State, out of date in a socialist State and serves no social purpose.

November 22, 1958 *Swarajya*

ARMY COUPS

ONE country after another in the emancipated East is witnessing, and quietly accepting, military coups. Things looked perfectly safe for the politicians but overnight they find themselves brutally replaced !

"We are not against democracy," explains each commander-in-chief who has blown off parliamentary rule; "we are against corruption and against corrupt political parties." The people admit the charges of corruption and inefficiency levelled against political parties and leaders and accept the new masters, without protest. Alas, they do not know about the corruptions that prevailed and will continue to prevail in the spending of money by military officials. They are deceived by the uniforms and the blunt manners and the parade-bred drill-tidiness of the officers and their men. They mistake these for

efficiency and honesty. Parade is very different from civil administration. The contractors that serve the defence departments know the truth but they won't speak out. Indeed they hope to thrive in yet greater measure under the new regime.

Be this as it may, the events have proved that easy come, easy goes. The people became free from foreign control, and from kings and feudal masters. But the talent for government through democratic institutions has not grown and shaped itself and proved equal to the task.

The breakdown of all moral values as a result of the continuous world-wide attack on Religion and traditional values has made democracy more difficult than ever it was. Kings and feudal lords in their days remained on the whole god-fearing and wise enough. But with the progress of negation of everything beyond the material and the breakdown of moral values, and the consequent upsurge of greed and dishonesty, democracy has become the rule of those who can most corrupt and buy influence and votes. Political parties have been roundly condemned by general after general, in almost the same language, in each one of the coups and not a voice is raised in protest.

It will take some time for the people to see that the army which seized power can be no better than the citizens from whom they have been drawn and the generals no better than the politicians whom they displaced.The competition for leadership among army officers will soon develop ugly forms. There will be invitations for foreign occupation, for this is the natural end of all corruption. Meanwhile, the old Western imperial and quasi-imperial nations accept these new military dictatorships as if nothing serious had happened. Indeed they continue their 'aids' with greater zest, provided the new despots are against X and against Y and are moderately pro-Western. The political philosophy of acceptance of *de facto* governments is vigorously pursued in order to gain time against rival alliance

and affiliations. It is only the *de facto* government of China that stuck in the throat and failed to be recognized, and a Formosa problem was created by America for the benefit of Asia. Sudan and Pakistan appear to make no difficulty for American ideology.

Indeed a new theory is being developed. We are told that colonial emancipation must be followed up with generous and speedy economic assistance and it is even hinted by a prominent British Labour leader that a lack of this speedy assistance brought about these military coups. It almost looks, therefore, as if the money-lending West welcomes these military simplifications of administrations in the debtor-countries, because the 'aid' is more greedily accepted and absorbed.

The particular paradox of the British Commonwealth is as intriguing, as it is distressing. There is no concern shown in the West generally or in London as to the effect on the democracy of India with whom Pakistan is in constant conflict. There is no heart-searching as to the place of such governments in the logic of the Commonwealth.

It is perhaps unwise, besides being ungrateful, to analyse the American Aid programme at this hot juncture. We are inescapably being driven to accept foreign arbitraments and advice on all matters as a result of economic entanglements. And this, in spite of the war-clouds in the horizon contradicting the performance of contracts for supply from abroad to suit our ambitions in regard to speed and size of 'progress'.

November 29, 1958 *Swarajya*

AMERICA'S CHINA POLICY

THE condemnation of American policy in regard to China is fairly universal. But it is specially refreshing to read the frank criticism and censure by enlightened American public men of their own Government. Their language is unambiguous and marked by the forthrightness of American style.

The criticism is not only of the Quemoy strategy but of the whole of the China policy. It was least expected but it has happened that Mr. Dulles has returned from Formosa with the conviction that Quemoy must be defended against China. It seems as if Mr. Dulles is one of the scourges of God sent to confound human arrogance and bring it to its destiny.

It should not be difficult for the most foolish among wishful thinkers to give up the hope that Chiang Kai-Shek will ever reconquer the Chinese people and hold China. Not only is he not the type that could achieve such a conquest of hearts, but there is not the least chance for such a miracle in the external conditions that govern the course of history.

Can the Chinese people be divided into two nations on the basis of two 'isms or on the basis of two foreign policies? Nothing can be more illusory than such a hope. It is therefore not surprising that the censure of American policy is not confined to America's friends abroad and that men and women have risen in America itself to condemn the policy followed in respect of China and Chiang Kai-shek. If *The New York Times* reflects American public opinion, there is a present and insistent demand that America's China policy must be drastically changed.

Mr. Lewis Mumford, the well-known social philosopher and writer, has raised his voice against the current American policy

in respect of China : " The Government of the so-called Chinese nationalists," says he, "is not a Government at all, but a displaced army." This strikes at the root of the matter. It is not merely a Quemoy issue or a question of military expediency. It calls for a total revision of attitude and a drastic change from A to Z.

" Whatever the original merits of the American decision," proceeds Mr. Lewis Mumford, " to back Chiang Kai-shek after his army had abjectly yielded to the communists, our present alliance with this defunct government and our support of its supine army has ceased to have any justification."

It is not only Russia and China that level charges of aggression against America. Mr. Lewis Mumford points out how Taiwan (Formosa) serves as a base for American nuclear forces which openly keep threatening the Chinese mainland. It is on this background that we should appraise Mr. Dulles's latest pronouncement on the strategic necessity of holding Quemoy against China.

It is clear that there is a rising tide of public opinion in America itself against America's China policy and against America's nuclear policy. The sooner the backing of Chiang is given up as a first step in the required change, the better will the cause of world-peace be served.

It is nothing short of silly for a great Power to attempt leaning on the fiction of a Chiang Kai-shek-China and keep the China seat in the U.N. from its lawful occupant. If the U.N. is to be an instrument for peace and not of cold war, the *de facto* Government of China must occupy that chair at once. The whole world knows China to be somewhere else and not with Chiang Kai-shek but the farce is solemnly played and allowed to be played.

Equally foolish would it be for America to depend on an Asiatic wall of military dictatorships to contain communism.

Whether it be in Pakistan or Thailand today or in other lands tomorrow, such dictatorships cannot last, and, while they are propped up, would incite and encourage the underground march of communism. Military rule and the terror on which it rests invites the very enemy whom it is the intention to keep off through such futile defences. Has not the history of India shown that military administration depends on the co-operation of the people and its days are ever numbered, however terrible and awe-inspiring its beginning may be? It would be as futile as dishonourable for America to prop up these military administrations that are growing up like mushrooms in Asia around the communist block. America would be false to her fundamental political philosophy if she did this. It is as true in politics as in other matters that the best and safest course is to follow *swadharma*—one's own philosophy of life—and not to adopt another's *dharma,* however attractive it may be at the moment. The world is not inadvertent but is marking with dissatisfaction how America is supporting monarchic, feudal, military and other undemocratic regimes inconsistent with American's basic spirit and fundamental political convictions.

Unlike in other democratic countries, high American officials are in the habit of making public statements which in other governments would be impermissible to officials and reserved only for a Prime Minister. A Vice-Admiral who will soon be Commander-in-Chief of the Allied Forces in Southern Europe has declared that "World War III has long since started," and that we foolishly refuse to recognize the fact. "We are locked in a life and death struggle with the communists and we are not doing too well," says this officer on behalf of the Allied Powers.

A British officer would hesitate uttering, at this juncture, a war-mongering and provocative untruth such as this. "The only logic that makes sense to our enemy is backed by military power and the willingness to use that power," says Admiral Brown to remove all doubt.

The rest of the world is somehow seeking to prevent war, while these American officials exult in beating the most dangerous drums of war, urging people towards that tragic futility. Homer of Greece and the *Mahabharata* of India have described both the fascination and the futility and tragedy of war, long before mankind realized it again at the end of World War II. But atom bombs and arrogance cloud the brains of nations who imagine they are born to guide the affairs of all the nations on earth. Apollo thus describes mankind to Zeus in Homer : "Those wretched creatures who like the leaves flourish for a little while on the bounty of the earth and flaunt their brilliance, but in a moment droop and fade away." Once Zeus himself said to the horses that the gods gave to Achilles's father : "O, why did we give you to share the sorrows of unhappy men? Of all creatures that breathe and creep about on mother earth, there is none so miserable as man." The gods who saw the tragic futility of war have no respect for man who has not ceased to indulge in it, inspite of every bitter experience.

December 1958 *The Asia Monthly*

LIMITATIONS ON HOLDINGS

'CEILING on holdings', 'ceiling on land ownership', 'ceiling on personal cultivation', etc.,—these are the daily headlines in the newspapers. The idea is born of an unfortunate jealousy complex and does not serve as a practical step in any egalitarian scheme. It surely does not help food production. It serves only to feed the ugly passions of jealousy, envy and greed, intended to produce the maximum crop of votes for this party or that. The competition in this race for mass favour is between the ruling party and the communists and other socialist parties. The horses are run, not on a limited

race-track, but alas, on the entire precious field of agriculture. The hoofs are stamping out all motives for increased interest in a noble occupation that stood highest in the scale of value throughout the ages in India, and which notwithstanding all our industrial development is still of vital importance. Where the black spirit of pure jealousy takes the place of Reason, the situation gets particularly dangerous in democracy. Rule by majority of votes under universal suffrage is good or bad according to the character of those who secure votes.

What is it that prompts our government to propose these legislative limitations on the size of holdings? If we rule out just mass-jealousy and vote-hunting, it is a desire to give opportunities to more and more agriculturally minded persons who are anxious to secure opportunities for this avocation. If this is the aim, how is it expected to be attained by putting a ceiling on the size of holdings? What do you propose to do with the excess? Are you going to set up a department of government to administer the excess land, say, by auctioning out leases? God forbid! Corruption would be continent-wide and take new and strange forms, not to speak of the total collapse of the main objective. What can result from these ceiling proposals hanging in the air without any constructive programme, except just political machination, subterfuges and depression of the industry of agriculture, and a lowering of land values with consequent increasing inflationary trends in consumer goods? Why should owner-farmers be the targets of special attack, and why should floating lessee-farmers be treated as privileged citizens?

What is called for is a substantial increase of *economic* holdings. This cannot be achieved except by a well-considered scheme by which the small holdings of un-economical size are supplemented with contiguous land and a plan for consolidation and exchange. All this can and should be done on a voluntary basis, for land is not just furniture to be given away to the highest bidder, but should find not only a willing but a fitting owner. There should be no transfers without real and just

compensation. The willing co-operation of all people concerned may be supplemented by the exercise of governmental powers of 'land acquisition' for carrying out these objects. In fact such powers exist and call only for an extended definition of 'public purpose'. Suitable facilities for long-term credit have to be organized to enable all transfers to be made on a just basis without resorting to the cheap and inglorious method of confiscation and nominal 'compensations', to satisfy the terms of the Constitution without obeying its spirit.

But the one thing essential in formulating and working out any such plan is that the ballot-box should be forgotten, Government should call into aid thinking agriculturists and avoid the advice of vote-culturists. The misuse of power leads to the discrediting of politicians as a class and to thoughts of violent displacement of democracy, for which there have been too many models round about us.

December 6, 1958 *Swarajya*

INEVITABILITY OF HIERARCHIES

In a recent article in the *Yale Review,* Mr. Reinhold Niebuhr, the eminent American, has made a thorough analysis of the slogans of Liberty and Equality. However well-known the limitations of these political ideals, a re-examination and re-emphasis cannot but be useful, especially where progress is not organic but rather like hot-house cultivation. Mr. Niebuhr has re-emphasised the inevitability of social gradations as well as their corruption. If we let ourselves be drawn over-vigorously into the chase for equality, we must set aside the ideal of liberty. We cannot pay unqualified regard for the individual and his liberties if we must rush headlong to reach equality. And

vice versa if we wish to preserve liberty at all cost, we have to accept inequalities.

The necessity of a gradation of authority and function in any community or common enterprise must be obvious, says Mr. Niebuhr, to even the most casual observer. Every school, every church, every production operation or sales organization must have its hierarchy. The political order is integrated by the same sort of hierarchic structure. Even democratic communities are integrated by military and civil bureaucracies which depend upon rigorous adhesion to the prescribed chain of command.

Nor can we prevent the prestige, power and privilege of the upper levels of this inevitable hierarchy growing inordinate. In spite of these unwanted consequences, the necessity for the gradation of function and authority cannot be eliminated by any abstract equalitarianism.

This explains the much boosted recent effusions of disappointed individuals in communist countries, e.g., Djilas's *New Class* and Pasternak's *Dr. Zhivago.* To use Mr. Niebuhr's words, " the social hierarchy is as omnipresent in a liberal community as in a traditional one and for that matter in a communist one. " Djilas, Pasternak and others have only proved this. Liberty and equality are twin *regulative* principles not realizable together in the absolute sense.

What is possible of achievement in a virgin continent with an advancing frontier and an expanding economy is not possible in countries that have not these advantages. Emerson's advice to ' each man ' that he should see that " he can live all history in his own person. He must sit solidly at home, and not suffer himself to be bullied by kings and empires, but know that he is greater than all geography and all the governments of the world " had meaning in spite of its exaggeration for the American with his advancing frontier and expanding economy. But it would be

merely braggadocio in other contexts and misleading if zeal runs away with commonsense.

Even America, some people feel, has now reached a 'have-not' status. An American university professor recently declared that "until we plant our flag on another planet with rich resources and learn how to transport them through interstellar space to the smelters and factories in Pittsburgh, Detroit and Cleveland, we shall be increasingly dependent upon overseas supplies." It is an illusion to think that what was done in America must be capable of achievement in India and that it is only lack of will and assiduity, and want of proper guidance, that prevent it. This illusion leads to a great deal of pleasant, expensive globe-trotting of eminent men and their wives and 'seminars' which have touched the borders of the ridiculous. It is an illusion, whether it be generous Americans that think it or Indian publicists hysterically shouting for foreign aid in order to achieve a 'higher' standard of life. We must resist the imitation complex and see where happiness lies and avoid where tension waits for its prey.

December 6, 1958 *Swarajya*

STATELESS CEYLONESE

WHATEVER be our particular national problems, there are some fundamental principles which we dare not ignore if we desire to maintain civilization. A person has rights of citizenship in a particular State because of his birth, or because of his personal choice to be a citizen of that State. His trade or other interests in a foreign State should not be a disqualification for his being enrolled as a citizen of the State in which he lives and has interests and stake, and of which he desires to be a citizen.

All this would be an elementary axiom, but in Ceylon we have a government that does not accept this axiom. It dislikes its citizens to hold property or interests in India and desires to bar persons of Indian 'origin' from being enrolled as nationals of Ceylon on that ground. Where any person desires to become a Ceylon citizen, but does this only to carry on as a spy on behalf of another nation, one can understand his being refused citizenship. But where his property, his avocation and interests, and attachments converge to make him seek citizenship in Ceylon, it is remarkable that the Ceylon Government considers it right and proper to refuse the application on the simple ground that he holds some property and has some interests in the neighbouring State of India. There is no question of double citizenship. The persons who seek Ceylon citizenship have no idea of holding and cannot in fact hold any citizenship in India. A recent judgment of the Ceylon High Court (delivered by Judge Fernando) has brought to glaring light this wrong attitude of the Government of Ceylon in the case of Mr. A. Marimuthu. The court has condemned the Government's refusal of citizenship in the case in pretty severe terms.

Had this been a single or exceptional case or one of a small number of that type, we could afford to be amused. But tens of thousands of families in Ceylon have been refused citizenship-registration on such and even more flimsy grounds, such as that the man visited India three or four times for some reason or other! This sort of thing makes it a case for international concern. Would America object to any of her citizens or would-be citizens visiting countries abroad or having property in neighbouring States, say Canada or Mexico?

The position is difficult to fit into any code of proper relationship between States. India is not an enemy country to Ceylon. Families of Indian origin who have settled there and lived for generations as honest people carrying on some avocation are today being refused to be treated as citizens, in spite of their earnest desire to continue to be Ceylon citizens. A State

may be entitled to restrict new immigrants but the question here is with reference to persons who have been living in Ceylon for years and years. The injustice is patent and the magnitude of the problem makes it one that calls for international attention. A man's own attachment should settle what State he belongs to, and it is not a case for investigation at all unless there are charges of some kind of criminal and anti-national activity. Would Canada refuse citizenship to anyone who seeks to be a Canadian citizen simply because he has some property in America? Or *vice versa*? A man's choice as to where he belongs must not be nullified by the decree of any executive authority. A refusal to recognize this elementary principle has resulted in a great body of 'Stateless' people in the island of Ceylon, which is a public scandal that must be terminated at once.

December 13, 1958 *Swarajya*

TRADE UNIONS IN INDIA

WHEN Labour took a place in Parliament in England it grew into a socialist party. Political forces have since then converted the Tories to the same view-point as that of the socialists. The full-employment Welfare State that socialists aimed at has been practically achieved. The problem for the Labour Party now is to find a programme that will restore labour's dynamic. They cannot fight for what has been already achieved. It is a serious problem to hold together a party when its work is over.

In India, the trade unions have not become a socialist party. They fight for themselves. They are still organizations fighting for bettering the earnings of the factory workers and improving their condtions. The Congress Party (and it is the

Government) has adopted the 'socialist pattern' of society as its goal and as a result there is no room for trade unions to father such an ideal, even if they had been inclined.

The aim of full employment and general welfare is indeed in conflict with the demands of labour in India. This conflict narrows the prospects in two directions. The demands of labour in India serve to hamper building up of fresh capital and prevents expansion, and thereby reduces the scope for relief of unemployment. Labour unions do not allow free competition in the field of labour, aiming at higher earnings for a limited number of people and shutting out others who are willing to give their labour for a lesser price.

A free market for labour will of course reduce the standard of wages, but it will result in expansion of industry and rise in the employment curve. It cannot be the proper aim of a socialist government to keep up high wages at the cost of expansion, when there is such a vast amount of ground to be covered by way of finding work and adequate wages for the unemployed.

Nationalization of industries, which is the natural programme of any socialist policy, will also conflict with trade unionist aims. The unlimited claim to carry on a bargaining struggle with the employer through a strike cannot for long be tolerated when the State owns and manages the industry or enterprise in question. Custom and privileges may continue for a time but the inherent contradiction must one day be realized and employees in a nationalized industry or business cannot but be treated as government servants or soldiers in the army. Decisions must be accepted when once arrived at fairly, and who is to judge this but the government?

Trade unions will of course continue and they have plenty of work to do. Over and above the sovereign function of maintaining and improving levels of skill and the quality of

production, and constructive co-operation with the managements in all these efforts, there is the regular function of representation, discussion and conference with the managements in fixing conditions of work and remuneration. We have now all the laws necessary to have grievances looked into by independent tribunals. That the unions cannot strike or disregard final decisions of Government in nationalized or semi-nationalized enterprises does not mean that trade unions have no duty or scope in helping to shape those decisions before being finalized. The psychology of struggle which acted as a dynamic hitherto is not available under a socialist government. It should be realized that the Government has robbed labour of its struggle-dynamic, and attention should be paid to the quieter and no less productive functions that are still open to trade unions. We cannot keep a war going when the enemy has surrendered.

December 20, 1958 *Swarajya*

WHAT WE ARE IN FOR

THE egalitarians are hovering over the land like eagles circling over the battlefields of olden times. 'Ceilings', 'ceilings for every income', 'no waiting but at once let us take over surplus land'—these are the shouts of the levellers miked by newspapers all over the country. The levellers have done no thinking about what is to follow the first sadist step. "We shall do it all, but this must be finished first," they say.

Limiting by law all ownership of land or house or bank deposits or other incomes, and confiscating the excess, is easy enough under the sovereign sway of Parliament. It was a difficulty for kings and autocrats, but is smooth work for democracy. After the limit is placed and the 'surplus' is taken,

we shall have a curious puzzle of a map of property and men. The placing of new ownerships will not be an easy task for anybody however infallible his talents may be, and whatever be the number that sit in committee over it. But let us assume it is done and we pass into content and peace. What is to happen after the first generation of favoured people die out? We shall have their families to deal with. Boys and girls will be born and claim succession. It takes but a few years for a family of five becoming a fighting group of twenty.

The sadists may feel a sense of fulfilment but the result of their governance of the country is an export of good material from the countryside to the cities and towns. Owners of land suddenly converted into holders of government paper will go to live where they will, spend what they hold. The spirit of frugality is an isotope of land ownership. When the connection with the green earth is broken, the man sees new and attractive uses for the bonds he holds. His whole mentality changes to adventure, to gambling and to pleasure hunting.

We have ever so much loose thinking in all matters. Tenancy legislation, as it is called, is making a galloping run to the goal where the 'tillers' get everything and the owner who bought the land or succeeded to one who acquired it, will have nothing but the pleasure of paying land tax and death duties. The legislators do not make any distinction now between the old farmers of revenue that came into existence during the British Company's days and those who hold land as ryotwari owners. If the holding is big, the sadist thinks he is a zemindar and invites Parliament to call the chase. Are the rights of the tenants enlarged and blown to bursting point heritable, or does the 'tenant' cease to exist on his death and pass no property to his sons and daughters (let it be always remembered that under our reformed laws daughters and sons inherit alike)? The map gets too complicate even when one just thinks of it. God help those who have to deal with the map in terms of human problems.

The fact is that apart from the emotional excitement of a landworthy desire to make poor men richer, and therefore happier, and apart from an electoral resonance excitement of spreading the net wide for votes, there is little concrete thinking as to what is to be done after the first sadist step.

Then, we have the *sarva roga nivarini* of co-operation. This is not a new drug. It has been tried for fifty years in several matters and uniformly failed to achieve anything desired. The varieties of dishonesty that get cover under 'Co-operation' are well known. Yet this has been pronounced to be the agricultural panacea. Co-operative responsibility may be good for many things but it is certainly as bad for the farm as polygamy is for the family. It is just impossible and trial will end in disastrous waste and vain repentance. Fragmentation of land and inflation of prices for everything but cultivable land will be the result of the present policy of expropriations galore.

December 27, 1958 *Swarajya*

THE WAY TO PEACE

ALL the rulers of earth want Peace, want Goodwill. But who is commissioned to find the road to reach Peace? Diplomats can make treaties, they cannot make Peace. Generals can intimidate with the assistance of scientists and armament technicians. These cannot find the road to the City of Goodwill.

International Peace cannot be reached through competitive intimidation. It can be reached only through Love, through the way shown by Christ, Buddha and the other men whose words are considered irrelevant to the business by the busy rulers of earth.

I had admired and loved Gandhiji through twenty-eight rich years of intimate joint labour as never grown up man admired and loved another. But it was in the last months of 1947 that my wonderment and admiration of Gandhiji rose to the highest pitch.

"Do you agree with me? Do you accept the doctrine of unilateral effort in love?" he asked me one day.

"There is no other way," I answered without hesitation and enthusiastically.

"Just so," he replied with delight.

He always felt acute pleasure when I agreed with him! For he had found that, of his half-a-dozen colleagues, I was the one most inclined to *disagree* when he laid down the law.

Gandhiji's theory of life and action was always this.

'What about the response?' 'The other party does not co-operate and so what good is it?'—all such questions simply disappeared as irrelevant, and the road was straight.

Some of us know this, but never before 1947 was the full meaning and intensity of faith so fully poured into the doctrine, as—in that wonderful year—he did incessantly and unweariedly. 'Non-violence,' 'civil disobedience,' etc., are all technical, specialised phases. The basic doctrine is *unilateral effort in love.* And this is the road to international Peace.

What about world-government? Yes, world-government can come one day, but that day is long after Peace and Goodwill are secured by dispelling fear and suspicion through unilateral love-effort. If we must manufacture inter-continental missiles of destruction even to have the courage to exist together in a wide world, are we going to let them rule us or they to let us rule them in a joint government of any kind?

If we can't jump over a fence, it is not easier to jump to the moon and fall on the other side of it. If a boy cannot overcome his difficulties in addition and subtraction, we cannot launch him on a study of quadratic equations as a means of progress in simple arithmetic.

Unless we secretly nurse Hitler's hope of total liquidation of nations at (cold) war with us, the only way to scale the high walls of distrust is unilateral effort in the noble art of friendliness, which was Gandhiji's technique, which was Christ's technique, which was Buddha's technique.

January 1959 *Indian Foreign Affairs* (Republic Special)

CAMPAIGN AGAINST NUCLEAR TESTS

A very common illusion of the human mind is to believe that the third or fourth step is easier than the first. And we attempt—of course in vain—to achieve the former because we find that the latter was found to be difficult, and believing that we could overcome the difficulty by first tackling what must come much later.

There are many good men in America who want the immediate banning of all poisonous nuclear explosions and who want the prohibition of the use of nuclear weapons in warfare. The campaign against nuclear tests in all countries is closely associated with a campaign for world government. Many persons favour the common source of human energy behind both the movements. But I venture to suggest that desire to achieve a world government as a prior step, and a means to bring the nuclear poisoning that threatens mankind to an end, is based on an illusion.

A world government means the subtraction of national sovereignty in a very large measure and the great Powers are all alarmist organizations who will not trust one another and who will not *a fortiori* hand over sovereignty or the best part of it to those whom they do not trust.

World government does not mean that you rule others. It rather means others rule you. And if America—as does Russia—manufactures missiles and hydrogen bombs for inter-continental and submarine use, it is because those countries are governed by politicians and technicians who do not believe in co-existence and mutual trust, but are convinced, and have been doing their best to educate their people to believe that the best defence of national existence is to make it clear that they have terrible weapons of retaliation. And this is naturally associated with a policy of armament manufacture to achieve that retaliatory strength and purpose.

Of course all this could be put an end to if we had world government. But we cannot have it by conquest. We must have it by agreement, which is impossible when the nations and their political guides look upon one another as enemies and seek to work continuously on that basis.

If the campaign for world government is only a general educative formula and it is not believed to be an attainable immediate goal, one can have no objection to it. One is apt, however, to believe that Religion and the principles of human brotherhood preached by all religious teachers and saints are better means of education in that direction than any literature issued as part of a secular campaign for a world constitution.

The fact is that good men finding the immediate task of converting their own people and their own governments to accept the policy of co-existence, and its risks, seek an escape in a campaign for something that is impracticable. The good men who want a world government must first prove themselves

on their own people and the political leaders that now follow the wrong policy of international intimidation as a means of achieving peace. Premature attempts to solve a bigger problem and failure therein will not help but cause frustration, and the campaign to stop the nuclear poisoning that is going on and aiming at a general relinquishment of nuclear weapons will suffer a set-back by reason of that frustration.

The campaign for world government will, if favourably received, begin by strengthening one of the blocks or at least will be so interpreted, and this will intensify the cold war instead of creating conditions for mutual trust.

I have ventured to make these comments on a campaign started by very good men. I may be wrong, but what I have said is worth considering.

January 3, 1959 *Swarajya*

ONE - FOOTED DEMOCRACY

DEMOCRACY in India is in quest of an Opposition. It is no longer a matter of doubt or debate but the ruling party in India is itself tired of its near totalitarianism. It wants, and realizing this it desires a strong and real Opposition. The leaders of the ruling party have more than once expressed this, while at the same time making it clear, as they should, that it is not their business to build an Opposition to themselves. Indeed if such an Opposition came into existence, it would be a sham. An Opposition must build itself and be obliged to nobody else for its birth and continued existence.

The Communist Party is no doubt there. If dislike of one another were enough to make a strong Opposition, we should have

what we want, in the Opposition of the Communists. But the fact is that the Congress has immobilised the Communist Party even as the Conservative Party has immobilised the Labour Party in Britain by taking up all the socialism of the latter. The communists in India, like the Labour Party in Britain, are a party without any work to do and suffers the maladies of life without aim. Kerala is a curious case and has no bearing on the question. What has happened in Kerala, for causes of local relevance, cannot be repeated elsewhere or at any rate, not in all India. The only Opposition that can be a true democratic balance to the ruling party in Delhi is a conservative party—a party that openly and boldly stands for and is guided by the principle of conserving what we have and what is good, before proceeding to change or disturb the *status quo.* Change should not come for mere compliance with untested, unrealistic slogans of revolution. The Congress has thrown to the winds this principle of conservation of what is good and rooted in the soil and has been acting more or less as a prisoner of its own slogans.

All the world knows that the Government of India under Congress has not produced good government and has not given welfare or happiness to the people who hunger for it. Indeed it has brought about a great deal of distress. Socialism can do good only if it went hand in hand with the principle of conservation of what is good and has taken root. If the Congress itself had realized and been guided by this principle, the absence of an Opposition may not have been felt except by academic upholders of democracy.

A good conservative party firmly adhering to the goal of general welfare and progress but careful of what we already have and what is good, may achieve through socialist advance more of happiness for the people as a whole than what the Congress has been able to do.

Even if lost opportunities make it difficult for such a party to gather enough strength to oust the ruling party, it can fill the

gap that now makes democracy hop on one foot and make for balanced and healthy progress. Exhibitionism, megalomania and an inordinate concern for dressing up the foreign window have left no room for efficient internal policies and attention to good administration. Centralization, the natural corollary of the 'slogan-socialism', has done immense mischief.

The gigantic pool of insurance assets have in the hands of the Government demonstrated the great error of centralization. It was an accident but a useful one, that mismanagement was made public. Normally, the nature of insurance business is such that many decades could pass without showing up even gross mismanagement. Fresh business hides all faults. If the business were in the hands of several companies, it would naturally be easier to locate and isolate fraud and mismanagement. Competition would come to the assistance of efficiency and evils could be localised.

The land policies of the Government have resulted in confusion, loss of incentive and lack of interest in agriculture itself. No longer is land the great and attractive gilt-edged possession and occupation it once was in India. Everyone knows that the policies, premature announcements and adumbrations of Government in respect of the ownership and tenure of land have brought about loss of confidence, confusion and lack of interest and brought down the value of all land, except of course building sites in cities and towns. City land has gone up in value and this is but a reflexion of the movement of population from rural to urban areas where there is some gainful employment available.

And now the slogan of land reform is co-operative cultivation. Has ever land been put under co-operative cultivation anywhere, anywhere except in countries where private personal liberty is absent and forced labour is commandeered under communist regimes? Co-operative cultivation plus procurement by Government can in theory be done, but in practice can be done

only by compulsion. Men do not feel any enthusiasm or even inclination to become wage-slaves, and peasants are least inclined to it. Co-operative cultivation will be a disastrous failure in our country. It is not an idea born of experience or thought, but a barren corollary of another error—a child of sadism, that of putting a ceiling on ownership of land with no scheme for distribution of the pillage that avoids fragmentation. The history of minor forests handed over to panchayats in Madras had better be studied by those who talk of cultivation by panchayats. The ruling party's notions, be they good or bad, become law. The people are tame, and those who feel inclined to resist are dependent on Government favour to carry on in their professions, and so the drift goes on unchecked.

Conservatism is not lack of patriotism or fervour. It is consistent with concern for the poor. It is wisdom and good management of national resources and can hold as much of social welfare as any other party labelling itself socialist.

Social welfare and the uplift of the poor and less privileged are no longer points of dispute and there is no sense in making a party cry of it now. The question is whether a programme of social welfare is to be based on the principle of conservation of what is good and rooted in the life of the people or whether it is to be based on sadist passion.

A wide public is waiting to give support to an Opposition formed on a sound basis, because the people have realized that one-footed democracy is not good and is not distinguishable from coercion and totalitarianism.

January 6, 1959 *The Hindu*

POWER WITHOUT WISDOM

"THE spread of power without wisdom is utterly terrifying and I cannot much blame those whom it reduces to despair," writes Bertrand Russell in his latest book. He wrote this in another connection, that of nuclear weapons and space adventures, but the statement is a general truth which applies to many particular cases. It does apply to the land 'reforms' so repeatedly advocated by the Congress Party.

The chief occupation of the ruling party as distinguished from its eminent leader is how to remain in power, and that leads to the search of slogans that most widely deceive. The Congress at Nagpur had raised no expectations in circles that knew the present obsession of the Congress, but the newspapers in India are disappointed and write melancholy editorials. They had expected commonsense to emerge from a large meeting of common men. The newspapers that criticize the outcome of the Nagpur meeting ignored in their expectations the main obsession of those that met there. Hence the disappointment.

Where in the wide world except in India are statesmen employed in curbing incentive, or putting a ceiling on the ownership of land, or expropriating property, or transferring the rights of owners of agricultural land to lessees or to the men hired to work on it? Nowhere, barring the areas under the monolithic communist way of life. The Government of India prides itself on having a goal of socialism divorced from compulsion and mass-slavery. But what has it achieved so far? And what does it hope to achieve ignoring the history and the example of countries whose enlightened governments have achieved full employment, general welfare and equal opportunities to all? Have they put ceilings on landowning or on incomes in England? Or in Denmark? Or in Sweden? Or in Germany? Or in Switzerland? Have they continually adumbrated in any

of these countries proposals that created widespread uncertainty, want of confidence, and lack of enthusiasm as has been done in this country?

Are those countries static? What is this 'dynamism' that spells the breakdown of confidence and individual exertion at the altar of a governmental machine that aims at a pattern which prevails nowhere?

Of course our country and our people are different from other countries and other peoples of the world. But that is the very reason why the present borrowed ideals—borrowed from fabian writings never put to practice but with totalitarian brute force—do not fit into the realities of our country.

The old bureaucracy disappeared with the British regime. A much less-equipped bureaucracy is now to carry out the fabian policies of the Congress Party and is to take over all departments of life-activities which the education and training of the officials never attempted to make them acquainted with even in the outermost fringe. Power and oppression create an illusion of competency, while all the time the effort of the official is to hide his ignorance and to rule by authority and the hypnotism of *mantrams* repeated and re-repeated.

State-trading in food-grains which is said to be 'inevitable' is blind faith in centralization and the first step in a chain of errors that will lead, through bottle-necks and loss by deterioration and warehouse depreciation, to rationing and general misery. Co-operative societies attempting to do agricultural operations will result in a new official zemindari system because co-operative societies will work only through the government officials in charge of them.

The final test of a welfare government is the achievement of full, gainful employment and joy in life. This is far from us, whatever '*ism* we adopt, but it is not in the horizon at all of

the present policies of the Congress. One fears that in the highest circles there is confusion between socialism and what is called the 'public sector'. A box of paints is not a picture. All paint boxes do not make good pictures.

Direct taxation on those who can bear it having reached an oppressive limit, the notion probably is that the State could make profit through the 'public sector', indirectly taxing the large body of victims that have to buy steel, cement and foodstuffs. State-trading in grains means making up for losses of all kinds and a margin of 'profit' out of which commission is paid to those who deal as agents for the Government. All this is paid for by the consumer who does not realize that it is concealed tax, but thinks it is a phenomenon in price variation that is outside the pale of criticism. As a matter of fact it would be a miracle if bureaucratic management should ever prove to be as frugal or careful as business run by even a second-rate managing agency. The attempt to 'form capital' out of nationalized business will be a complete failure unless indeed, as in the case of cement, exorbitant prices are extracted from consumers. The inescapable fact is that we have not a dedicated bureaucracy as the communist States have, and a body of workers who are completely at the mercy of the State. Indeed the upbringing of the officials has produced an aversion to commercial habits and more reliance is placed on statistical show-charts than on plain vigilance and frugal management. The only way to frugality in our country is through decentralization. Bureaucratic centralization leads to the exact opposite. Socialism is not just 'public sector' but the increasing absorption of the vast mass of unemployed and under-employed men into adequate gainful employment—gainful for the individual and for the community. The comparative merit of any arrangement must be judged on this basis.

What was Gandhiji's '*ism*? He repudiated the attempt to name it after him and deprecated the use of the term '*gandhism*'. He wanted that people should be educated in the idea that

everyone who holds a position and everyone who owns property or business should hold them as trustees for all those who have dealings with them and for the community at large. In brief his *'ism* was the *'ism* of trusteeship. This involves a programme of education rather than organization of machinery or sequestration of ownership. This social doctrine of trusteeship is not a new conception. It is as old as all our *sastras* and it is the common foundation of all great religions. Gandhiji's *'ism* was closely related to the recognition of moral and spiritual values of life and therefore to religion. The outdated but obstinate doctrine of enlightened selfishness should be substituted by this doctrine of immanent trusteeship,—by *dharma,* to put it in Indian language. Dharma must weave itself into every material activity of life. The education, or rather re-education, of the Indian people in this right way of life requires example, patience, and faith. The way may be long, but the short-cut of governmental coercion and the anarchy that is mistaken for dynamism will never reach the goal. On the contrary, it will reach and shape itself step by step as an inferior copy of communism and the suppression of human personality.

Even in the process a degree of suppression of personality has already happened. The single brain-activity of the people who meet in the Congress is to find out what is in Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru's mind and to anticipate it. The slightest attempt at dissent meets with stern disapproval and is, so to say, nipped in the bud. How can realism emerge in this atmosphere? "Power without wisdom is utterly terrifying," and no one seems capable of resistance or even willing to try.

Hope lies in the Congress dictator himself turning his back on unreality and resolving to build Indian welfare with native clay. But the great hobgoblin of consistency stands between Power and Wisdom.

January 17, 1959 *Swarajya*

VIOLENT SOCIALISM

It is not only lathis and rifles that make violence. A show of rifles is as much violence as actual shooting. The violence of legislative compulsion on a submissive people is of the same quality as lathis and rifles, and the coercion exercised through it is even more effective and more lastingly harmful.

Democracy is said to be the voice of the people and therefore of God. These fine phrases serve to hide the coercion and many another fault. Democracy worked through the system of political party organizations, as it must necessarily be done when huge populations are to be governed, is very far from the voice of the people which is said to be the 'voice of God'.

Everyone knows how the bosses come to a conclusion on the basis of their often faulty and biassed appraisement of what will please the greatest number and sustain them in power, and their decisions are imposed on the party, any dissenting minority in it being more or less suppressed at the altar of confidence in the leadership that serves to keep the party in power. Pomp and public splendour are called in to hypnotize an uninformed people.

The organization's majority decision becomes the 'voice of God'. The process is the reverse of the ideal democracy wherein the voice of the people, whether it be that of God or not, must precede the decision of the leaders. We thus can easily see, if we care to observe, the clay feet of the golden idol set up for worship.

The machinery of the State is a perfected instrument for exercising violence without exposing it to the eye. And in a

Welfare' State, i.e., in a State where private life and professions depend on the favours of officials, the processes of coercion are the worst conceivable.

The evolution of non-violence that was the dream of Gandhiji has been rudely stopped, and India goes the way of the other States of the world. With the goal of industrialization as conceived now by the Congress, the dream becomes more distant than ever. More and more centralization, more and more State control of everything, will be the history of 'democratic socialism' in India.

Instead of training in self-reliance, all the education is the other way about. The training is to expect the Central Government at Delhi to help the smallest and remotest village, with tax-obtained money and subsidies of all kinds for every purpose, and to give grateful homage to the party in power.

There was more self-reliance in the days when the government was foreign and was just a law-and-order government. Today Government's ambition is much greater but the way it has gone about the business has undermined initiative and self-reliance, in fact, undermined independence at the 'grass roots' and made the people tamer than under foreign rule.

I am not saying anything remarkably new. What I say is worrying Mr. Jawaharlal Nehru's mind, specially as he sees more and more of what has resulted from the policies adopted these dozen years, and more and more of what lies at the base of the human spirit.

But withdrawal is always the most difficult part of a battle. It looks easier to go forward than to confess or correct an error. What is wanted is a miracle of courage and a talent for orderly withdrawal, a withdrawal in which inevitable losses are bravely borne, but avoidable damage carefully saved to make room for a policy more consistent with non-violent socialism.

Gandhiji dreamed non-violence and he dreamed perfect social justice, and social welfare without coercion. How could social justice and social welfare be reached except through force? His answer was it *could* and *must* be done through the spiritual education of the people, and he developed the doctrine of trusteeship for this purpose. He had hoped to make this the fundamental of the economic life of Free India through right education. Any object sought to be achieved in a hurry and without waiting for the necessary popular education must necessarily be achieved through coercion; and the violence involved undermines and nullifies the object. The long way is the shortest cut.

We should realize that it makes little difference whether the Communist Party paints our house with communism or the Congress borrows from the communist his brush and paint and does the work with even less hesitation than the communist. The spirit and intent of Article 31 of the Constitution of India has been and is proposed to be violated in gigantic measure; and the large volume of the open violation does not make it less of a violation, but indeed aggravates the offence. Instead of annulling Article 31, it is made a mockery of.

Asuric democracy is not the democracy that we want. We want *satvic* progress in individuals and non-violent socialism for the State. If this is not to be, and the present violent socialism is to be persisted in, we must take it that it is the Communist Party that rules India by laying down policies for the Congress to follow without themselves undertaking the risk or the blame. This subtle process by which what we are supposed to oppose is allowed silently to conquer our own spirit and replace our own personality must be resisted, if we desire to save India for non-violence.

January 19, 1959 *The Indian Express*

LATIN AMERICA'S PROBLEMS*

In January all over India we hold prayer meetings to remind ourselves of what Gandhi taught. It was on the thirtieth of January eleven years ago that a Hindu young man brought Gandhi's life to a close, as he and his friends detested Gandhi's policy of goodwill towards Muslims.

The terms of Khrushchov's message to the President of the United States and Mr. Mikoyan's friendly visit seem to be more than merely conventional and ordinary and raise hopes among some of us of a new era of international goodwill instead of international intimidation and suspicion. It would be good at this time for Americans to read what Sir Stafford Cripps said at a service of intercession held in Westminster Abbey on Feb. 17, 1948 :

"May not the whole world learn from his (Gandhi's) life something of fundamental value? That it is idle to try and save ourselves from destruction by the use of force and that our greatest weapon of salvation is the supreme and redeeming power of love. No words could perhaps better sum up his spirit than those of Thomas a Kempis : 'Love feels no burdens, thinks nothing of trouble, attempts what is above its strength, pleads no excuse of impossibility; for it thinks all things lawful for itself and all things possible. It is therefore able to undertake all things, and it completes many things and brings them to a conclusion, where he who does not love faints and lies down.'"

---

*This letter (dated January 10, 1959 from Madras) was published in *The New York Times* of January 19, 1959 under the sub-caption "For International Goodwill."

WELFARE THROUGH COMPULSION

ALMOST like a reaction from the non-violence that Gandhiji preached and built all his hopes on during the last fifty years of his saintly life, we have an unrestrained course of compulsion ruling the policies of the Government of India. Gandhiji's conception of non-violence was not just abstention from the naked threat of beating or killing. It comprehended mutual confidence and faith in the persuasive power of human affection. It included the principle of respect not only for life, but for individual freedom. *Per contra* his abhorence was not only of beating and killing—but of all compulsion. He did not define violence as *violence to the person,* but included in it compulsion of every kind either through executive or legislative authority. He allowed for human weakness and hoped that this theory of life and self-government based on non-violence would be kept as a goal and not forgotten in our hurry to get things done. He knew, and wanted his people to realize, that things done by compulsion were only seemingly accomplished but were as far from real accomplishment as the North Pole is from the South Pole.

To the creed of non-violence, he added the principle of truth as a twin-brother. Like non-violence, truth was to him not merely verbal or apparent truth, but reality in the fullest sense. The so-called compensation awarded for taking over property in land, that is now thought to be a fulfilment of the pledge given in Article 31 of the Constitution of India, he would have deemed an untruth of the worst kind, because it is practised in the name of law. Untruth legitimized by law is the worst of lies.

If an honest effort were made to keep the principles of truth and non-violence intact in our policies, whatever be

our failures, they would be stepping-stones to real progress. Without them and overruling them, every success is but failure.

The breakdown of individual freedom, initiative, courage and strength under a reign of State compulsion is fatal. Not all the gold and splendour of the idol can save it from the consequences of its feet being of clay. The individual is the reality, the community is but an arithmetical idea. The whole is bigger but cannot be better than its parts. Society rests for its character and for its progress on the individual.

It is idle to speculate on what measures Gandhiji would have adopted to correct the evils that vitiate the Congress Party today. He had a power in his own person which he would have used up to the last drop. Today no one has that power. If anyone fasts today he fasts to get a request from the Prime Minister to give it up, and friends around work to hurry up that request. This is not power but futile imitation. Whatever remedies we ourselves, ordinary men of commonsense, can by unbiassed objective thinking devise to remove the evils, we must adopt and try them out. If, as I have dared often to assert with sorrow, the men engaged in the Congress at all levels, almost all of them, have become self-seekers and exploiters rather than servants of the Congress, if they take *out* of it instead of giving *to* it, what is the remedy? All values are now material and so we must find a material palliative, if not remedy. I would suggest that no one should be a member of any committee of the Congress or be in any position to influence its activities, unless he has a profession or calling which enables him to live. While he is engaged in Congress activities no one should pretend that he is independent, while he is actually *living on* the Congress. Be it manual labour, as a cooly or rickshawman, or trade or business or paid service of any kind, it should qualify a man to be in the Congress and take part in its activities. The absence of this should be a disqualification. He should make his position clear, every year, to the public and show that he does not draw

on his position as a member of the ruling party but lives within his means which are known.

If a man gives all his energy and time to the Congress and gets paid for it, it should be deemed quite honourable but it should be completely known, and there should be no pretence about it.

I have spoken about this to the retiring * Congress President, but while he approved of the idea, he felt many difficulties in the way and thought the proposal was too drastic to be put in force. I do not think so. If we do not feel anxious about immediate popularity among partymen we can put it in force. We cannot cure any malady if we are afraid of displeasing the patient. The rule I suggest will work a sea-change in the whole organization, and consequently in the whole of the political life in the country.

Once we wanted people to be free from the entanglements of occupations so that they could put forth maximum courage in the sacrifices called for in the political struggle. But today it is an unjustifiable anomaly, if an organization consisting mostly of jobless people and people who do not wish to follow any occupation or do honest work, should lay down the law and govern a vast country and seek to control all activities and occupations.

January 24, 1959 *Swarajya*

DISTASTE FOR MANUAL WORK

It may look like over-simplification, but I am convinced that the principal cause of all our backwardness is the distaste for manual labour prevailing among the classes. Not only has this

* Mr. U. N. Dhebar was Congress President at the time.

age-long defect been kept up without counter-moves against it, but every scheme of widening the area of education spreads this evil among the sections of the population that lived by manual labour alone. Our education seeks to convert the whole nation into a queue of soft-job seekers. The distaste for manual labour is thus being steadily universalized by the 'education' we give in increasing measure. It is not my plea that education is bad, but what we give as 'education' is wrong.

I read an article in a foreign journal wherein an analysis is made as to why Latin America, which had distinct advantages over her northern neighbours, has not progressed while the latter with all their disadvantages have won in the race for progress, and the writer confidently traces it to the continuing distaste for manual labour that prevails among the classes in Latin America—just as it does in India.

I do not believe in the sham worship at the altar of manual work that is sometimes done in the present day schools. Nor is sport or scout activity equivalent to what is wanted. Class activities of that kind, although they involve some amount of physical work and strain, do not go to the root of the matter, *viz,* the distaste for doing hard manual work as a reality, that is, for eking out one's livelihood. Sport and hobbies yield pleasure, but the distaste for pain and labour is not tackled by them. We have to make the classes give up the dislike to use their muscles for work. The use of muscles for play or enjoyment or for exercise is wholly different.

Merely shouting for work will not make any impression on the people. Educational and family lives must be shaped to convert all our people into labouring individuals. It is only then that the social and economic evils of our society will begin to disappear.

What do we see today? Everyone belonging to the so-called 'middle classes' as well of course as those higher up, always look

to the service of some one 'below' to do any piece of work that involves manual work and stooping to touch what requires subsequent cleaning up. How can any equality dawn in the horizon as long as we allow this psychology to continue ? Apart from equality or inequality, how can economic progress issue out of such a condition ?

Much has been said about the phenomenal progress achieved in China. Many causes can be discovered and much can be claimed for particular ideologies on those grounds. But if we observe the Chinese way anywhere in South-East Asia, it will be seen that the great difference is that those people have no distaste for manual work of any kind. Khrushchov has discovered the defect in the scheme of education that prevailed in his country and has taken drastic steps to remove the defect. We must, in India, turn our attention in this direction if we wish to avoid pain, misery and frustration.

January 31, 1959 *Swarajya*

DEPENDENCE UNDER INDEPENDENCE !

I am not sure that what I write will reach the intelligentsia of Pakistan. But I am writing this for them also.

When India (including the Pakistan area) was about to get freedom and the only impediment that British Conservatives found in their favour to put off the Indian demand was the fear and the opposition of the Muslim League to be placed under Indian majority rule, India through Gandhiji offered all the autonomy now enjoyed by the people of Pakistan. Yet it did not satisfy the * Qaid-e-Azam and the League. What is the situation now and what would have been the condition of affairs if Gandhiji's

* The late Mr. M. A. Jinnah, the then Muslim League leader.

offer to the Qaid-e-Azam had been accepted by him and the League? We would have had an army and other defence forces under a joint command and a common defence policy against outsiders. We would have had no mutual fear of military aggression. We would have had autonomy for the Muslim area as well as for the Indian. We would have saved literally millions of rupees for fruitful, sensible expenditure on the people, and raised their condition from poverty to full employment and happiness and hope, without having to borrow, beg or steal, or what is worse than all these, to tax the people so heavily—all for practically nothing but increased administrative and defence expenditure.

We would have had no Kashmir problem, for in the absence of military insecurity and fear of mutual aggression this problem would not arise, and Kashmir would have been like Travancore or Hyderabad. Today what is the real state of Pakistan but transfer of dependency from under Britain to America? The dependence is worse for its not depending on a Constitution but on the undefined executive policies of the nursing Government abroad.

And, as a result, India too is forced to a similar condition, for action always produces an equal reaction. India too has to be on an uninterrupted mission for foreign aid. It makes little real difference if we first overspend on defence and then depend on American or other foreign assistance for welfare work, or whether we do it the other way about, directly borrow for defence expenditure, saving our resources for welfare expenditure.

And what a curious game it is, for America to lend or give to *each* country in the name of making an anti-communist bastion but really the defence expenditure in each country is for defence of offence against the other country, as between India and Pakistan—a fact known to, but winked at, by the foreign aid-giving Government. It is folly from our point of view, that of India *and* Pakistan. It is no less an amusing and foolish game for

those who aid us, either by gift or sale, or hire-purchase of the naval and military arms and other military equipment that they do not need for themselves, now that they depend entirely on nuclear deterrence for their own security.

I have said enough to start people thinking on both sides of the border, between the two divided members of the Indian continent. It is a tragedy how what could have been such a great and prosperous and happy nation now stands divided and reduced to so painful a dependence after Independence.

The superficial inquirer may ask the question : Why then did you agree to partition as finally framed ? The answer is, because half a loaf is better than no bread. The bread of freedom would not have been obtained if the League and the Congress continued in disagreement. Freedom was not to be obtained by either but only by both. That was the riddle which the British statesmen and Mr. Jinnah between them produced for us to solve. The nearest to agreement was partition, and in that sense freedom was obtained by both, not together but separately. If we had not agreed to divide and that way solve the riddle, we would have continued today where we stood : not only we, but Burma and Ceylon too ; and the life of the colonial empire of Britain would have been prolonged.

Two different and independent nations can unite in amity and trust, and achieve self-dependence. There is nothing in the world that we cannot correct, although we may not restore the *status quo*—if only we have the will and the courage and God in His mercy help us.

February 7, 1959 *The Hindustan Times*

RETREAT FROM GANDHISM

MR. Jawaharlal Nehru is averse to revise the steps he has adumbrated as leading to what he calls socialism. He feels compelled to take these particular steps which he thinks he has pledged his party to.

The fundamental and fatal error in these ideas is a reliance on compulsion, a reliance on the coercion of new laws rather than on the people themselves. When the object is to produce a new way of life, it is necessary to bring about a change of heart and of culture among the people. If we desire the great mass of humankind who have lived and grown in India to adopt an altogether new way of life, we must have faith in the people. The means adopted for any end decide the quality of what we achieve. What is imposed by law cannot result in what is to be brought about by persuasion. A little alteration even in the arrangements of the elements that go to compose a substance makes nectar into poison. The policy of coercion now contemplated will make what can be life-giving nectar into poison.

Those who see the error, and wish it to be avoided, have not the courage even to say it aloud, much less to do anything to bring about a change of policy. Their affection for the leader that is guiding the policies of Government and their calculations as to personal losses and gains make them prefer to remain silent. The Prime Minister's persistence, the irritation he shows at any opposition, overawes them into inaction. He sees their external submission and thinks he has persuaded them all to see that he is right, and is confirmed in his opinions and the correctness of the steps he is proposing. His advisers, even when they have grave doubts, are satisfied whispering privately to friends about them, but feel it safest to raise no adverse voice in council and to drift and await consequences.

We are offering tributes to the memory of the Father of our Freedom on the platform whereon his body was consigned to the flames, but allow his two main teachings to be forgotten and discarded. He preached all his life against coercion and compulsion. He preached against any kind of untruth. Yet the way in which certain fundamental Articles of the Constitution relating to property and occupation and compensation are administered is glaring untruth and make-believe. Compulsion and expropriation have become the warp and woof of the socialism we are weaving. This was not what Gandhiji was dreaming for the emancipated people of India. Policy has taken on the form of persistence of pride before which reason retreats.

The compulsion of Government has to be exercised on criminals and morally disturbing elements but it is not a way to bring about a change in the people's way of life. What can be achieved only by a heart-change in the people cannot be brought about by coercion. If we do not know how to bring about a heart-change, it will not do to give way to impatience and resort to coercion. We shall that way fill the land with crime and evasion and be led into more and more coercion, for one fault leads to another and yet another.

The situation is grave. Those who believe in a Power above have to resign themselves and pray for light and courage to descend by a miracle. May be, Mr. Jawaharlal Nehru himself may see light. Not only will a change of approach not lead to a 'betrayal of the nation' but a fresh flood of loyalty and affection will be the reward.

February 9, 1959 *The Hindu Weekly Review*

THE HANDLOOM

We encourage the mills to throttle the handloom. The Leviathan has seized the local market. The people, men and women, are being conditioned irretrievably to wear mill products and mill products only, and we ask the handloom weavers to live on the foreign market !

These weavers are not a small aboriginal tribe, but they are a sizeable fraction of the whole population. Theirs is the biggest rural industry next to agriculture. They have no other opening in life and they are multiplying. They are patterns of skill and industry and family life. What they ask for is only a continuation of the traditional home market in *dhotis* and *saris*. They are all over the country and are being gradually reduced to squalor and misery. What is our socialism doing for them ? The mills can thrive on a variety of production even if *dhotis* and *saris* are protected for the handloom. It is no good making one believe that we are helping the handloom by just levying a cess on mill-production and doling out subsidies to 'co-operative' bosses. What every occupation wants is a market, not doles and subsistence grants.

This has been a long-standing problem but it still remains unsolved; and it cannot be solved by ignoring it. That the weavers have so far managed to live, in spite of the mills, is proof not of a sound policy in respect of their profession but of the extraordinary skill, industry and stamina of these unfortunate people.

Co-operatives do not and cannot contain all our handloom weavers. Very much over half are outside the co-ops. The extension of the co-ops is not a matter of education or persuasion

but, again, of a market for the handloom products. We do not solve the issue by pushing the product into co-operatives. The co-operatives will break if they take too many members and if they cannot sell the stock accumulated. The only solution is protected home-market for the stuff and then the rest would automatically follow. Co-operation would then work splendidly and extend itself to cover every handloom weaver. Co-operative societies are not a substitute for the market that the handloom weavers want. The weaver knows to take care of himself if only we do not deprive him of his legitimate market.

To over-provide for and coddle a certain number of them by giving them special facilities through co-operative societies is easy. We may save their votes by such gestures, but the real problem remains unsolved until we give the weavers the entire *dhoti* and *sari* market.

The mills have thriven by imitating the handloom *dhati* and *sari* and the original weaving population is being strangled. It is not a problem of the best method of production but a human problem, human beings working and living on an occupation in their own homes and asking for nothing from government except that they should not be robbed of their market by persons who can get on very well otherwise. There is no more urgent or important a problem for socialism to tackle. A fraction of the cruelty practised on landholders may justifiably be exercised over the textile mills. The richest people in the land are these mill-owners and the handloom weavers are being hit hard by them. The total number of workers living on the handloom far exceeds the textile workers. The latter can have plenty of work without depriving the former of their bread.

February 14, 1959 *Swarajya*

WHERE WE ARE DRIFTING

Reform requires change but not every change is reform. This truth is lost sight of.

Change is reform and the more 'leaping' the change, the more rapid our march to progress—this appears to be the policy-notion of the Government of India today.

The party-managers in the various States lay down proposals simply upon their appraisement of the vote-value of the change—it may often be a wrong appraisement—and these become the unanimous resolutions of the Congress Working Committee and thereafter it is the policy decision of the Government of India. The ideas of the party-bosses of the various States are just guesses as to what will *please* the numerically larger groups of voters, not necessarily what will benefit them—it is enough if it *seems* to benefit them. A morbid pleasure in cruelty is the malady of the poor in countries whose people have been emancipated from colonial rule and hunger for happiness. Democratic statesmanship consists in coping with it, not in conforming to it.

A very recent judgment of the High Court of Madras has passed strictures against the manner in which the Government seeks to obtain legislation in contravention of the spirit of the constitutional provisions as to compensation for compulsory land acquisition. It may be the Government take the case on appeal and even win. But the attempt to ignore the spirit and defeat it through the latter means, remains reprehensible all the same. Compensation has become a mockery where rights are taken away in the name of land reform. Shares are valued at market rate when companies are taken over. But arbitrary principles govern compensation for land.

"An insignificant number of people only will be affected by the 'ceiling' on land-ownership. We have promised land-ceilings to the people. It would be betrayal to go back on it," say the Congress bosses. The confiscated land, they know, is not enough to serve any general purposes, such as giving economic farms to the large rural population. Nor will new management raise the food-production. It is an accepted fact that fragmentation is detrimental to good production. It is planned, therefore, to organize co-operative farms with the land taken over. The transfer will be from interested efficiency to irresponsible inefficiency, from owner-management to that of an official of the Government who will be placed to supervise the co-operative concern, like a British Resident in the old native States. There is no rural or agricultural foundation in the education or subsequent training of the officials concerned.

The idea of exempting well-managed farms from the adumbrated ceiling law is a confession and a snare. It is a confession that the proposal to expropriate above a level of acreage is not a measure of socialistic levelling down but issues out of a notion that Government is going to make arrangements for better management of lands which have been neglected by greedy owners. The notion is a bundle of contradictions and based on the well-demonstrated fallacy of good management resulting from too many cooks. The exemption programme of 'well-managed' estates will be a fine opening for collecting funds for the ruling party for political nepotism. It is needless to dilate on the dangers of discretionary expropriation, the discretion being entirely or ultimately in the hands of the executive.

'Leaping progress' Mao of China wants. That is what the Congress too wants in India. 'Revisionism' is treason in the communist countries. So also it is looked upon in India too, now. Slave-citizenship and totalitarianism will be the natural terminus of this 'leaping progress', if mismanagement does not bring about an earlier breakdown of the scheme.

A reliance on compulsion—the compulsion of law—as distinguished from a reliance on the people is what has become the policy of land reform. What socialism really demands is a change of heart, not an unwilling people yoked to the law. A new way of life, a new culture, is what is aimed at. This cannot be achieved by coercion but only by a heart-change. If we do not know how to bring about a change of heart, it will not do impatiently to rely on coercion, which will lead on, step by step, to nothing else but what the communists believe in. The British Commonwealth and the American Government erect bastions against communism and we are very much involved with them. We too vigorously attack the Communist Party whenever occasion lends itself, while we at the same time do all that is required to instal their system of government and their way of life, and suppression of the individual in place of democracy.

What true socialism should work for is to bring into existence a state of things in which every one in this vast rural continent has a free and gainful occupation. The more independent the occupation is of government intervention, the greater is the achievement. That is where it differs from the communist way of life which is one where the State owns the citizens and all their private lives. We are drifting into this very state all the while scoffing at communism. The Leviathan is taking the place of the landholders.

February 14, 1959 *Swarajya*

WHY I SHOW THE RED FLAG

THE programme of expropriation of land above a certain allowed maximum will, it is stated by the Prime Minister of India,

affect only an insignificant number of people. The truth of this claim depends on the maximum area that is fixed. If this, indeed, be as stated, it will not serve the purpose of giving land to everybody or to a significant number of landless people.

Apart from that question and assuming the accuracy of the statement that the proposal will affect only a small number of people, it is obvious that it is injustice and tyranny to pass a decree of expropriation on a body of law-abiding citizens serving the nation with marketable food-grains because their number is small and, presumably, because they cannot offer effective resistance in a democracy based on universal suffrage.

It would be a tyrannical use of power, unless the purpose of the expropriation is entirely justifiable and full market value plus a percentage for the compulsory character of the public acquisition is paid and not merely promised in instalments as a miserable subsistence allowance.

The object of any infringement of the constitutional right to hold property should be justified. Mere good intentions cannot suffice, but it should be shown that such good intentions will be carried into effect and the object achieved. There is a great deal of reasonable doubt whether the 'passionate' desire of the Prime Minister of India will be achieved at all by the policies he has decided to put into effect. His ambition is to do something great and good for the people of India in his lifetime. But the means he is proposing to adopt involve an outrageous amount of disregard of established rights, which makes the affected people, [illegible] ers who think ahead, to protest.

[illegible]io of C[illegible]

Ethics is a disciplin[illegible]dia[illegible]eans, not of ends. Expropriation is not ethical at least ac[illegible]ng to the accepted notions of our country and our Constituti[illegible]n. The good intentions of statesmen are often 'sold short' (to use an Americanism) by their unwise and inappropriate policies.

"Power always thinks it has a great soul and vast view beyond the comprehension of the weak."

— John Adams

Socialism, or a policy of general welfare, does not consist in any angry attack on those who have in accordance with the laws of the land acquired a comfortable position. It does not consist in an unattainable aim to do away with all that is above the average. It is a theory of human happiness depending on fruitful work. Every proposal to attain this object should be tested on the touchstone of absorbing the unemployed.

Land absorbs labour, be it in the hands of one or more. There is no magical power achieved by transferring ownership from one who lawfully holds it to a larger number of donees, just because it will help in the absorption of more of the unemployed. The land now sought to be expropriated was not acquired by any feudal law but under the ordinary common law governing all property. There is no justification available for the measure by way of punishment of sins committed by the present owners or their predecessors in title. Socialistic endeavour must turn from anger and cruelty to sane measures for absorbing the unemployed in fruitful work.

Everyone agrees that centralized factories are by no means enough to absorb all or even the larger part of our unemployed. Everyone agrees that the progress of the country towards well-being depends on providing scope for full employment. This cannot be done by providing government posts or jobs in government-controlled industries. Population cannot be shifted according to arithmetical plans on this huge continent. It must be done only by smaller industries springing into existence in small towns and what may be called the rural areas round about the farm villages.

The big industrialists are not going to bring these small workshops into existence. Nor can the State undertake and

manage a vast number of such small concerns through the bureaucratic machine. The only hope for such rural industrialization, as is necessary for the well-being of this large country, is that the richer landlords may find this a good investment, supplementing their own interests. They are the natural entrepreneurs of the smaller decentralized industries that should come into existence. It is, therefore, not good policy to depress them by so-called reform and make them disinclined and incapable of any such enterprise which will be the result of the present drive against the richer agriculturists.

The smaller peasants will find it hard enough to find the capital even for their own agricultural operations, not to speak of investing in minor industries. This is the only way out of the vast unemployment problem. The possible alternative is co-operative bodies being constituted out of small peasants to start small industries. This answer would be right in an academic way but not likely to fructuate in practice.

Many are the reasons advanced against the adumbrated changes by persons who are not unpatriotic or hard-hearted and have had close contact and considerable experience of affairs. What has been here specially pointed out is an aspect which has not hitherto been discussed and which deserves more than casual polemic attention.

The decrees of expropriation contemplated will not increase food production, and will not absorb any additional unemployed men. They will fatally affect prospects of rural industrialization. Any attempt on the part of the Government through bureaucratic organization to start and manage small industries spread over the million acres of our land will fail miserably and it should not be necessary to go through that experience to learn the inescapable weakness of official enterprise. We must depend on local capital and local enterprise and the urge of honourable self-interest for this change of the face of India. We should not

allow any resort to the Fabian adventure of uprooting what is too deeply imbedded to be tinkered with.

An open mind is an essential substitute for want of direct experience. It is a pity that the bulk of our legislators are men and women whose only experience has been a patriotic struggle and not any productive occupation. Agricultural experience in the field and in the village is not a part of the working equipment of the majority of our political leaders. I appeal to them for opening their minds to what equally patriotic men have been urging against these proposals whose only merit is that they may bring more votes into the ballot-box.

February 16, 1959 *The Hindustan Times*

TO BENEFIT WHOM?

To benefit whom is this proposal to deprive people of the land they or their predecessors in title have acquired according to law? The bulk of the rural population in India will not benefit by some few of them being thrust into petty ownership carved out of these expropriations, an ownership which they cannot sustain with capital or credit. Nor will the large section of the people in the countryside get more employment as a result of the break-up of the larger holdings. The donees of expropriated land may gratefully give their votes but they will not have the wherewithal for any profitable cultivation. They would have to borrow heavily in order to buy livestock at present prices and obtain all else that is required for good cultivation, but they have little credit at their command. And what is more, there will be no prosperous class to lend them in the present state of fear as to what new legislation may come over the head of money-lenders. The Government will have to undertake all the lending and see to the proper appropriation

of the sums granted. Any State official who has dealt with loans to poor agriculturists for digging wells or other purposes will be able to inform the Central Ministers how much the Treasury will have to write off such accounts !

The employment of the landless people in the rural area will necessarily go down with the fragmentation of holdings. The ceiling scheme will not serve to absorb more of labour than what the bigger holdings now employ. In no way, therefore, will the poor landless labourers benefit by the schemes now vaguely adumbrated.

'Every school-boy' knows that the parings resulting from the ceiling plan will not go to any significant extent in reducing the poverty or landlessness of the vast rural population. There are far too many hungry mouths for distribution. To the extent that contractual arrangements can provide work and a living occupation to the poorer population in the rural area, this is being done now and no increased employment will result from the 'reforms' that are now announced or contemplated. It may be possible to deceive voters to think that a great and wonderful distribution of land to everybody is being organized but a little thinking will show that this is not any more practicable than the achievement of universal happiness by taking over the wealth of the few rich industrialists and distributing it among the poor.

The one test that must decide whether a step proposed to be taken is a good one or not is whether it will materially reduce the unemployment in the rural area. It is not a good plan, even were it practicable, to drive the rural population to move out to industrial centres far from their native villages. We must establish centres of work, be it agricultural or other, that will absorb the energy of these people and give them fruitful occupation near about where they belong. To establish more factories somewhere in India may go to some extent to draw off men and women from where they live a life of rural

worklessness to factory life. Apart from the intrinsic demerit of such a plan, it is obviously impossible to expect much to result from a project which means a change of the face of continental India to total industrialization. Even were it possible of achievement, how many factories in a district can accommodate the population and who will finance and frugally manage them ? God forbid that the State should think of undertaking the responsibility. The result would be gigantic mis-management. Private decentralized responsibility alone can cope with it without disaster. For this, we must leave people and their resources untouched in order to bring up such private enterprise into existence.

Before anything in this direction is taken up for thought, we must remove the illusion that the expropriation of the rich and prosperous will result in universal happiness or even that a sizeable number of poor people will become suddenly well-off. It is this illusion that takes cover behind several names and phrases—one of which is that the Congress is 'committed' to the ceiling programme. No individual or party should proceed on the basis of a commitment to error. To withdraw from error is what we should all be committed to. The test of the correctness of a step is whether it is good or bad, not whether one is 'pledged' to the step. Where a party defends a scheme on the ground of being committed to it, it means that other justifications have disappeared.

Not to benefit any one but to raise illusory expectations in the minds of people who are poor enough to believe anything—this can be the only reason for the expropriatory programme. The dread of losing votes to the communists is the dynamic behind this leap into what experience deprecates. This is also the explanation why the West so uniformly welcomes the adumbrated plan, obsessed as it is by the one idea of 'containing' the communists. To contain communists, we cannot ruin the country that we love or ourselves become communists in practice.

February 21, 1959 *Swarajya*

ALMOST PERSONAL

NOTHING gives me greater satisfaction than the general resistance to any 'attack' as it is understood on Mr. Jawaharlal Nehru. This is as it should be for the good of India and its future.

There is no unifying force so effective as loyalty and affection, be it in England to queens and kings or in India to their acknowledged leaders. Nations under the pressure of modern scepticism and personal ambitions and jealousies would go to pieces but for some over-riding loyalty of this sort. And it is God's grace that there is a good man in India who deserves to be idolised as he is. Let no one misunderstand the criticisms and apprehensions to which I have deemed it my duty to give public expression during the present period of ferment and impact of foreign forces. It was most unfortunate for India that Gandhiji was assassinated by a stupid group at a wrong moment in our history. It was even more unfortunate for India in the present concrete context of internal affairs that Vallabhbhai Patel died when he did. If only he had overcome his illness and his heart-aches and lived, it would not have been necessary for me to speak or write as I have been doing.

Some people are disturbed to the point of distress and dismay when they find persons whom they respected and revered differ from one another in public. This is a sign of immaturity. If we have to run not a war, or a movement, but a democracy we should get used to such things and learn to think and discriminate, at any rate not to be distressed at the sight of differences of opinion over the policies of the government. Holding together is all right when we fight a foreign enemy; but in conducting the affairs of a people whose number is 400 millions settled in more than a dozen distinct areas, open discussion is all-important.

Rightly or wrongly I feel that it would be a lapse from duty if I remained silent when I sense danger and damage. Others might fear to speak but my loyalty and affection give me the courage to speak and write, even fiercely where I feel fiercely. I feel I have no reason to fear any harm in expressing my views. The measure of my faith in Mr. Jawaharlal Nehru's integrity and qualities of heart is the measure of my courage in this respect. The dynamic that impels me to warn is not of any base kind but a sense of duty—a feeling that when those who could have more effectively warned and advised are not available—the hand of death having deprived the nation of their wisdom—I, who remain, would be untrue to the trust and the love that they had been bestowing on me if, preferring quiet and ease, I kept silent over what I felt. I repeat that what I have been saying and writing is a fulfilment of duty and it does matter very greatly to the nation that these things should be said by some one whose detachment, if I may presume to say so, is generally speaking not doubted. There is nothing so important for the leader and ruler of a great, big nation as independent and fearless advice. There is nothing so bad for the nation as for its guide and ruler to live in a palace of mirrors where he sees, wherever he turns, only his own reflection.

Our country and our people who achieved a civilization of the highest type, material, moral and philosophical, many millenniums before other nations reached a comparable state, must continue to live a way of life wherein the individual freely gives to the community and is not reduced to the condition of a screw or nut in a lifeless machine, for the sake of illusory progress in the material sense.

The world is facing two dangers, one nuclear annihilation (we cannot accumulate so much danger and yet remain safe for all time) and the greater danger of a soul-destroying urge to live in greater and greater comfort, and having more and more desires. The nations that are prosperity-mad have lost tranquillity and the sense of a true purpose in life. The tension that

they have developed for themselves is infecting the whole world. We should be warned against this and resist the fatal inroad.

It is better that we remain poor and happy than be favoured with facilities to grow richer and lose our independence. I was surprised and shocked to hear an eminent Australian say that his country has become a satellite of America no less than any one of the East European States to the giant U.S.S.R. This may be a figure of speech. But God save us from making ourselves a satellite to any other nation on earth. Let us cultivate friendship and international brotherhood but let us not make any Big Power our big creditor or our spiritual master. The craze for higher and higher standards of living should be substituted by a craze for spiritual freedom. There is a great deal in our own philosophy which we have to re-learn, a great deal that we should preserve for our own happiness.

Let us not be deceived by the adulations of outsiders. It is a part—the latest part—in the strategies of the cold war. There is almost what I may call a mass drive for 'friendship' on the part of the West. Monetary aid and technical assistance are almost being pressed on us even without our asking. The time has arrived when we should resist these gifts and depend on ourselves. Self-help is more important than gaining time. Delay does not matter but losing independence matters very seriously.

We should drop the ambition to see things in our own time. It is enough we see things taking shape and we may leave a great deal to those who come after us. Soon achieved is soon lost. We should have the wisdom, the gift of sight to see achievement in the steps we steadily take towards it rather than indulge in the vanity of accomplishment in our own time. Above all we should avoid doing injustice and undermining public confidence in the uniformity and stability of Law, which is not made by arbitrary legislators but formed in the conscience of men and which is not varied by the changing policies of governments. Otherwise individuals, who are the ultimate reality, will

lose a sense of purpose in life and the nation which is made up of individuals will find it hard to progress merely depending on the compulsion of government.

February 28, 1959 *Swarajya*

AN APPEAL TO AMERICA

THE way in which India is being patronised by American statesmen embarrasses us. According to what they tell their own peoples, India is engaged in an experiment in government for the good of the Western people.

This is not what we are doing. We are not carrying on any experiment for the benefit of others. We are doing what we can for ourselves and not for the sake of erecting an internal bastion against communists or an external one against China or Russia. We do not look upon China as a dangerous enemy across the border as America would have us do.

The greatest danger to our peace and our real progress comes from the imitation of the American idea that increased expenditure is a measure of happiness, and from the complexities this is producing in all the problems of our advance towards enlightened public life and general happiness.

Our efforts in the international field are directed to banish the nuclear menace of war and of injury to world health in which efforts, unfortunately, America in effect refuses to co-operate on account of her unreasonable fear of her present great rival in the world.

Our efforts for international peace are towards a more durable and reliable peace than what is secured by a balance of

terror so uncompromisingly persisted in by America. We want peace without tension, peace that may truly be called tranquility. This is not impossible as the Western governments believe. The genius of India is tranquility and its mission in the world is the conquest of fear by the strength of the spirit within. China and India have lived for many millenniums in mutual peace and tranquility and have during these thousands of years exchangeed philosophy and religion, besides articles of commerce. We deprecate the recent efforts of some Western statesmen to frighten India about China. It is an invitation to India to join the cold war which we unhesitatingly reject. If America does something substantial and effective to end the cold war that sits like a blight on the world, America and India can be the greatest friends and colleagues in world-effort. India is truly and positively neutral and no biassed interpretation of her attitude can help to understand her.

February 28, 1959 *Swarajya*

RELIGION AND THE STATE

We are told that in the U.S.S.R. census held in 1937, the people of the Soviet Union were asked to declare whether they were believers or non-believers. The majority expressed their alligiance to religious beliefs. The census returns of 1937 were, therefore, scrapped and two years later in 1939 another census was held on the basis of a new questionnaire from which any mention of religion was carefully deleted.

Notwithstanding the care taken by the U.S.S.R. rulers to exclude figures as to religion, it is known that the Lutheran Church claims 13 lakhs active members. The Baptists number five-and-half lakhs of baptized members and claim besides about 30 lakhs sympathisers. The strength of the big Orthodox Church can

be gathered indirectly but quite reliably from the sale of votive candles ! It is estimated to be between twenty and thirty millions of practising members. An official organ of the Communist Central Committee complained recently that party members, and even party functionaries, particcipate in religious life.

All this must be an eye-opener to some of our Indian admirers of materialist philosophy.

Perhaps the one most determining cause of the international distrust of the communists is their open atheism. Their word does not command full value. Hence the difficulty in arriving at any agreements with them. The communist leaders have done great disservice to themselves by their needless denial of God.

That religion is the private affair of each citizen and that it is of no concern to the State, is the doctrine of the secular State. But it is not true in that sense. It is true in the sense that every citizen should be free to choose his religious beliefs and that this liberty should not be curtailed by the laws of the State. But it is not true that it is of no concern to the State. Religion furnishes the motive and the sanction for conduct—more than any laws or regulations of the State—and the conduct of the citizen is a matter of greatest concern to the State.

The international power and influence of the Soviet Union would have been much greater than what it is now, had not the communist party tied itself to atheism. It was wrong of them to assume that material progress had been hindered by belief in the governance of the world by a higher power. They did not foresee how much they lost in international credit by this proclaimed faith in No Faith; Peace by negotiation would have been much nearer had the Soviet official faith not been declared to be atheism.

So far as India is concerned, her roots are in religion and in the broadest tolerance. To the extent that this has been disturbed, there has been deterioration in morals and consequent injury to

public interests. To the extent that we hope to restore religion to its time-honoured place in India, we may look forward to that purity of conduct and self-denying concern for the nation which will usher in true prosperity and happiness.

March 1959 *Broadway Times*

GANDHIJI'S APPROACH TO PROBLEMS

EVERY year we arrive at certain dates in the Julian calendar when we all indulge, including those responsible for the governance of India, in empty oratory and ritual adulation of Gandhi who gave us freedom with hopes of his own.

He hoped that we would use our political freedom to build up a self-government that will take us nearer to his ideals of individual and national life.

He had in his mind a freedom wherein the individuals would govern themselves more and more, and the State would govern less and less. The Welfare State he had in his mind was one where the freedom of the individual was not reduced. It was not in his mind that the Leviathan should control all private life and private enterprise. He believed in restricting the controlling activities of the State and in an increasing measure of realization of the individual's duty to hold all that he holds as a trustee for all those around him.

He did not want the State to intervene in all things and tax the people to such an extent as to kill incentive and purpose. He believed in the better and fuller development of the sense of moral values. He believed in the governance of the country through *dharma*, leaving the citizen to incur moral opprobrium when he failed to play the game rather than in the method of

the veiled violence of State-compulsion which defeats its own purpose.

Instead therefore of empty adulation and ritual homage we should at each birth or death anniversary of the Mahatma suffer the pain of self-examination to see how far we have fulfilled or failed to carry out his expectations. These are points of particular importance for those who have undertaken the government of the country apart from the numerous corollaries of his well-known approach to human problems. Have we reduced administrative expenditure? Have we decentralised government and State-responsibility? Are we at least going in that direction or are we going the opposite way?

Are we making the citizen more and more self-reliant or are we doing the opposite, making him more and more hungry for grants and subsidies, making him more and more eagerly loyal in order to get favours?

Are we reducing our military expenditure or are we falsifying our creed of non-violence by example while increasing our lip-service to that creed and its implications?

Are we less and less dependent on external help or are we getting more and more entangled in the coils of foreign assistance?

Are we making the people more and more industrious and creating incentives and facilities for it or are we losing ourselves in the idea of factory industries concentrated away from the villages? Are we really helping and increasing village industries or are we increasing the bondage of man to the big machine?

Have we, as it appears, reached the maximum of open taxation and been compelled to resort to taxing all routine consumption so as to conceal the demand and increase the burden on the poorer section?

These and other questions we must ask ourselves and honestly answer them. Ritual homage is no substitute for faith and truth.

March 7, 1959 *Swarajya*

BERTRAND RUSSELL'S ADVICE

THE BBC's European services included a broadcast of Mr. Anthony Lejeune wherein he led an attack on Bertrand Russell's thesis in his book *Commonsense and Nuclear Warfare.* He has posed two questions :

One is : "Is it justifiable to recommend a policy which would freeze the *status quo* in Eastern Europe, where so many innocent people are subjected to an utterly arbitrary tyranny ?"

The other is : "Ought we not to accept the *risk* of destruction rather than the probability of domination by a system we hold to be profoundly evil ?"

First : Does Mr. Anthony Lejeune or any other gentleman believe that the maintenance of nuclear armaments on both sides (which is the position now) tend to or raise any hopes of the position in Eastern Europe altering ? Does Mr. Anthony Lejeune believe that the West will enter upon any war to liberate Eastern Europe under present conditions of balanced nuclear power ? What is the lesson of the fate of the Hungarian revolt except that the West dare not use its power even when there is a call from "the innocent people subjected to an utterly arbitrary tyranny" ? The nuclear power of the West does not serve any purpose connected with Eastern Europe.

Secondly : Is it only a *risk* of destruction that the nuclear armaments involve ? Is it not *more than probable* that con-

tinued tension and a series of crises will sooner or later produce war, and is it not certain that such war means destruction?

Does Mr. Lejeune or any other critic of Bertrand Russell believe that as soon as there is a relaxation of the present balance of nuclear power, Russia will march to reduce the West to subjection?

Is not what is stated by the critic to be a *probability* just a risk, and what is described as being a *risk,* a certainty?

It ought to be fairly clear now that there is no plan or ambition for a military conquest of the West by Russia. What is really to be envisaged is an ideological conquest and the mad race in nuclear armaments does not meet that eventuality. On the contrary the way of life for which the West stands is being steadily eroded by the implications of the armament race.

Bertrand Russell's wise advice should not be met by the stale argument of national fears or disposed of by mere polemics, but should be taken seriously to heart if the world and its hopes have to be saved. The issue is too grave and calls for something greater than skill in argument. Immediately important is Bertrand Russell's wise and moderate advice that "the Russians and the Americans should both revert to the official courtesy which used to be observed between governments and should abstain from publicly imputing tortuous motives to all moves that appear *prima facie* to be conciliatory". No treaty and therefore no peace or thawing of the cold war can be hoped for if offers are to be always distrusted and rejected on the basis of the fundamental unreliability of the capitalist or the communist world!

March 7, 1959 *Swarajya*

GANDHIJI'S ANSWER TO MARXISM

I adhere to my doctrine of trusteeship in spite of the ridicule that has been poured upon it.

— MAHATMA GANDHI

As the citizen's duty of non-violent disobedience enunciated by Thoreau was the basis of the Gandhian struggle against foreign rule, the basis of the Gandhian answer to the modern challenge in the Welfare State is the duty of compassion.

The fulfilment of the citizen's duty of disobedience led to freedom from foreign rule and the realization of India's self. The fulfilment of the duty of compassion enunciated in the Upanishads and the *Gita* and reformulated by Gandhiji will lead to the liberty of the individual and freedom from totalitarian governance. A nation enjoying the blessings of minimum government and citizens fulfilling the law of compassion—this was Gandhiji's answer to the challenge of Marxism.

The duty of compassion is based on religion and flows from an inescapable God-given urge leading to a true one-ness of all life. The identity of oneself with those around should be realized without any external compulsion, and without losing one's own identity in the process.

यस्तु सर्वाणि भूतानि आत्मन्येवानुपश्यति ।
सर्वभूतेषु चात्मानं ततो न विजुगुप्सते ॥

As a result of the long continued impact of the baser elements of Western civilization, the glamour of the new and expanding knowledge of the physical world which came as a well-intentioned gift from the West and the onslaught of proselytizing propaganda, India has almost lost her religion. When faith is corrupted by doubts and undermined in the

heart, the preservation of ritual does not make up for the loss. There is little of true religion left in the strata permeated by Western influence. But so far as the nation is concerned, it is not wholly lost. If the educated classes, the leaders of society, recover their souls there is time yet to recover lost ground; and recovered life may even be stronger than the damaged previous possession. India can recover her faith in the values of spirit that her Rshis laid down for the people. It depends on whether the need is recognized by her leaders and the urgency of it realized. If this is done and the discipline of compassion becomes the way of life, we shall be enabled to present an answer to the challenge of the times so far as India is concerned and also set an example to the world.

Marxism, the communists claim, is the only answer to the challenge of the times. We are not prepared to accept that claim. Not only do we consider the violence that historically preceded that way of life, wherever it has been imposed, as a great evil, but we do not want the individual to become a lifeless screw in a vast machine called the State, and that too under continuing State-compulsion. The individual is the only reality. The State is a non-living entity. The Leviathan has no soul. If the individual is wiped out we reduce the nation to a soul-less existence.

It is claimed by 'socialists' that theirs is the alternative answer to the challenge of the times. Reject Marxism, but accept 'socialism' they say. But what is socialism but pure and simple State-compulsion? In the result the individual dies in the one as in the other. Indeed it is an illusion that the two are different and that the one is an alternative to the other. That it is possible to establish 'socialism' without the violence that accompanied communism but through democratic process does not make it different. Whether the individual is violently made to die, or accepts death without resistance, the resulting death is the same. The individual ceases to exist whether it is murder or suicide.

If we wish to retain the individual and attain the general welfare with his fullest co-operation, the only way is what religion has from time immemorial taught—the duty and discipline of compassion. The sharing of one's goods with those around one, and of their joys and sorrows, can be done without handing over your soul to a lifeless machine, and as an activity that yields joy to the giver as well as the receiver. It is not necessary for a mother to die for a child to be born. The mother lives for the child she has given birth to without herself losing her life. So also can the individual live and 'die' each moment for the community without losing his life, if the natural law of love and compassion were allowed to work. Compassion is a God-given endowment which makes each life feel the pain of another and find the pleasure in relieving it as if it were its own pain relieved. If this urge that is in every heart is not killed but made into a way of life, it is the answer to the challenge of the times. The communists always called their way of life socialism. The Congress's socialist pattern and the Government's plans to achieve that pattern may not be introduced with bloodshed but carried out through parliamentary sanction. But the end is the same—a soulless Leviathan taking possession of all personal life and strangling it to death except for whatever life is needed to work as a serf. Along with this, compassion itself is killed.

The socialism envisaged by the Government of India, if it is worked with energy and meets with no casualty by reason of corruption, mismanagement and bureaucratic wastefulness or for want of foreign aid, will lead to exactly the same nation-wide state of compulsion and serfdom as we condemn communism for. There is no socialist country in the world which has achieved its aim without wiping out the individual and atrophying the human mind, without converting the entire community into a body of slaves, without creating a privileged class to run the machine. India's experiment even if successful will only end in that result.

The true alternative to the Marxian answer to the call of the times is not an illusory copy of it, or a preparation for surrendering to it, but something quite different in character and in its fundamental basis. The doctrine of trusteeship adumbrated by Gandhiji, namely, that rich people should hold their superfluous wealth as trustees for the poor and that this way of life should be inculcated by example as well as precept without compulsion or cruelty is the only true alternative to Marxism. It is entirely different in character from the Marxian solution. It is based on religion, the antithesis of which is the Marxian foundation.

Gandhiji had no time to expand and illustrate the way of life which he adumbrated. But he definitely put it forward as his alternative both to Marxism and socialism.

> Indeed at the root of this doctrine of equal distribution must lie that of the trusteeship of the wealthy for superfluous wealth possessed by them. How is this to be brought about? Non-violently? Or should the wealthy be dispossessed of their possessions? To do this we would naturally have to resort to violence. This violent action cannot benefit society. Society will be the poorer, for it will lose the gifts of a man who knows how to accumulate wealth. Therefore the non-violent way is evidently superior. The rich man will be left in possession of his wealth, of which he will use what he reasonably requires for his personal needs and will act as a trustee for the remainder to be used for the society. In this argument honesty on the part of the trustee is assumed.
>
> Those who own money now are asked to behave like the trustees holding their riches on behalf of the poor. You may say that trusteeship is a legal fiction. But, if people meditate over it constantly and try to act up to it, then life on earth would be governed far more by love than it is at present. Absolute trusteeship is an abstraction like Euclid's definition of a point, and is equally unattainable. But if we strive for it, we shall be able to go further in realizing a state of equality on earth than by any other method.

> Complete renunciation of one's possessions is a thing which very few even among ordinary folk are capable of. All that can legitimately be expected of the wealthy class is that they should hold their riches and talents in trust and use them for the service of society. To insist on more would be to kill the goose that laid the golden eggs.

It is not on mere authority that this solution is presented now. It is presented on its own merits for acceptance as a way of life which would be in accordance with the ancient *dharma* of our land and save the nation from chaos and oppression and loss of soul. It is a way of life, besides, that will give true happiness such as is not available otherwise.

It may seem that what is suggested is to hand over the whole problem to the sweet will and pleasure of the rich. It is not the case at all. When *dharma* is made to prevail over the land, misconduct invites the great and powerful sanction of social obloquy and personal unhappiness. It is the only non-violent way of reaching our goal. Any other would end in soul-killing compulsion. Any form of compulsion to produce the behaviour we seek to establish is not a way of life, but just prison discipline. A way of life must be voluntary and this means we should bring about a change of heart among people in general which is the function of a revival of religion in its true and substantial sense.

The question is whether we want a way of life or only prison discipline. We have seen prisons and know what they are like. No argument should be necessary to prefer that which alone can produce a way of life, viz., a revival of *dharma* and a re-installation of higher values, and in particular the revivification of love and compassion inherent in human nature which has only been suppressed and overwhelmed, not destroyed by the incrustation of so much that is contrary to it. The pain that one automatically feels at the sight of another's pain is an inescapable gift of God to the human soul, though the gift is in the nature of a pain and a burden. It is a natural

urge that makes a person one with those around him. Out of this fundamental pain or urge issues the doctrine of holding the goods one holds as in trust for others also and not only for oneself. Such a trust is a joy and a privilege to the individual.

Compassion based on *dharma* is a noble urge different from the vulgarity of condescension. It is a way of life that forges a union. Co-operation is good, but it is only joint adventure. Compassion welds people into a single and indivisible entity. Unity with those around one, with individuated life for oneself, is the secret of healthy citizenship. The individual should live fully, eagerly and purposefully and not become just a bolt or a screw or a lifeless brick, lost in a machine or a masonry construction. If this is to be achieved, neither socialism nor Marxism is the way but only the *dharma* re-emphasized by Gandhiji.

To revive and strengthen religion and the consciousness of pious obligation would achieve general welfare and happiness preserving the spirit of industry as well as of brotherhood, without damaging the value of individual human personality or the graces of life. This is better than trying to achieve our object through the deadening influence of organizational compulsion even were it granted that it could achieve the goal.

What is recommended may seem to be a long road but *shorter roads do not lead to the goal* though they may give sadist satisfaction. The long road leads to the goal and as we go along it we find and give joy and betterment all along at every stage and what we do binds the people together as no compulsion can do, be it brute force or the coercion of status.

No doubt, the fanaticism brought about by bloodshed and cruelty can produce a new way of life without waiting long. But if we do not like this, there is no choice. If we do not

want subterfuge, wide-spread discontent and corruption, and failure, we must go through the long road. Spurious imitations and eye-washes can be achieved easily but big things cannot be reached non-violently except through the long road. We must patiently work and attain the wide-spread spiritual conviction which is the essential basis and condition for making an ancient people accept a way of life not based on compulsion. We must put forth the stamina and personal conviction and the patience required for leading a religious and spiritual revolution. Fortunately the way of life we want is not wholly dissociated from the highest traditions of the land and the revolution we desire is only a re-assertion of the principles of religion this nation has always unquestioningly accepted.

March 14, 1959 *Swarajya*

THE TOUCHSTONE OF POLICY

WHAT was the reason for this flop ? The easiest way out would of course be to shrug your shoulders and say that State policy is not arithmetic, that you can't always find where the mistake in the sum is, and hence the reason why it didn't 'come off'. But it is no good doing that, because in most cases you *can* find the mistake, and if you can, it means you must.

—Adapted from Sergei Obraztsov's *My Profession*

Socialism cannot produce wealth. It can only distribute what is produced. The prior problem in India now is not how to distribute, but how to *make* wealth. The question is, therefore, before any policy is adumbrated, whether it will help increase honest hard work which alone can make wealth. No other consideration is so urgent and so important as this. The problem of India is how to produce more. The answer to this must decide all policy, what should be done, how it should be

done, and at what pace it should be done. I maintain that what Gandhiji called the doctrine of trusteeship is the best creed of distribution for our country and it stands the test of the question which I have said should command priority. Not intolerably high taxes, nor confiscation, nor egalitarianism can solve the problem of India.

A question may be asked whether there is any instance of a country whose well-to-do people have been practising such a difficult doctrine as the doctrine of trusteeship. This doctrine issues out of the inherent limitations on the personal value of worldly possessions and the faith most people in the world have about God and what God expects of man. You may clothe this faith in any form, but it is the sustaining core of human life. Although it is not generally realized, it is a fact that in America —from whom we have already borrowed over Rs. 400 crores and from whom we are going to borrow yet further huge sums, all to be repaid in dollars, i.e., in goods produced such as America would buy—the well-to-do believe in and practise this doctrine of using wealth to help others without being forced by the State to do it. This is being interpreted occasionally as aimlessness by cynics and self-righteous critics of the American way of life. But it is really a case of the natural law of trusteeship solving the problem of the motive of life. *Dharma* is not only an ethic, it is a law of nature.

So much and so well is the doctrine of trusteeship established in America without being given that name, that it has been generally acknowledged, even by adverse observers, that in that country in this materialistic age and under capitalism, better and more equable social conditions prevail than in many countries whose governments are declaredly egalitarian.

The lesson to be drawn from American life is, first, produce before you seek to distribute equally or unequally; secondly, get the full value of your possessions by treating yourself as a trustee of your superfluous wealth for the benefit of others who

evoke your compassion; you are master of what you possess but your mastery is expressed altruistically.

What is possible at the very high levels of wealth of American citizens is also possible at lower levels. The quality of it can be the same whatever be the measure or the total quantity. But if there is no wealth which overflows one's own needs, mere socialism cannot create additional wealth. What creates wealth is hard toil, human labour *with* labour-saving gadgets if you have them, or can get them from somewhere without suicidal cost,—*without* them if you do not have them, and if especially there is an excess of population who can employ themselves in that labour.

The real problem in India is how to increase labour, chiefly bodily labour. In China they have no compunction in getting it done by compulsion. But even State compulsion cannot succeed unless supported by a revolutionary voluntary urge. It is no good ignoring this task and confusing or exciting people over the inequalities of possessions, or any other matter that diverts popular attention from the real task. Whatever policy is proposed in any field, be it education or land or industry, it should be such as will evoke the desire, or at least the willingness, to put forth more bodily work, and create fruitful opportunities for such work. This is the supreme touchstone. It is such policies that should really be called Left or Radical and advanced. Right and Left are wrongly understood by men whose eye is only on the impossible distribution of the inadequate wealth we have among an enormous population and who mistake confiscation and expropriation, and the ignoring of fundamental rights of individuals, as in themselves a praiseworthy advance towards progress.

March 21, 1959 *Swarajya*

WANTED A MOVEMENT

A strong government and a loyal people no doubt make a good State. But a deaf government and a dumb people do not make democracy. Democracy is not just a statutory entity. A knitting together of people's hearts makes democracy, the hearts being not of sheep but of men.

I have had forty years of contact with the saint who came to show a new way of life and an altogether new way of resistance against evil. The sieve of time has of course dropped many impressions and many details but what remains has by that process become all the clearer and firmer :

That happiness, either of the individual or of the body of thinking and feeling men and women called the nation, depends on character, not on material possessions or on the prospects of getting them later on.

Again, that reform must always come from within; and that loyal devotion to God is the spring of all reform from within and compulsion or violence, of any sort, makes no reform.

The problem of national happiness consists in nothing so much as in a change of heart. That should be our real ten-year plan. It does not need any annual confirmation by parliamentary vote at budget time. It calls for a nation-wide movement, for it is based on something more than a majority vote, the nature of man, something permanent.

Happiness does not depend on competition either among ourselves or with other nations. We cannot 'catch up' when we are behind other nations by centuries. Indeed why should

we 'catch up' if our aim is not show but welfare and happiness? And if catching up depends on external aid, it is a temptation and a trap; we shall be entangled in a voluntary moral subjection worse than military occupation.

We have to conserve what we possess of virtues. We must keep off new attractions that do not add to, but undermine old virtues. The inner urges and the unquestioned religious convictions which form the framework of action are far more important and effective than laws and regulations which the State may seek to impose. Nothing should be done to sabotage those urges and those convictions that have issued out of age-long co-operation and experience and the climate of a particular national life. As in art, so also in government, the artist or the ruler must fully feel and put himself in harmony with one's land and people. Then only can good results be achieved.

Today our rulers have strayed away from this axiom. They feel as if they belong to a higher race and have a mission to impose their convictions on the people. Their language is far too reminiscent of foreign autocracy. The musicians of India are even now in perfect tune with the land of their birth and its people. So the music of the musicians continues to give joy. In contrast with this, the disharmony of the Government is striking. The activities of the Government being in disharmony have brought into being a sense of uncertainty and insecurity and have destroyed initiative. They have created disincentives for work and thought, which alone add to national wealth. Men and women have come to look upon the State as they look upon the stars and planets whose decrees of fate decide and which they cannot hope to change.

Two things are essential, a movement to make all people work hard whatever their place or their job, and a movement to make the rich feel they are trustees of what they hold beyond what they need for themselves. These can be sought to be

brought about by extreme compulsion, but by far the most efficient way is by a movement for voluntary acceptance of these essential and right conditions for progress and happiness. They are in the tradition of our people. They will preserve the graces of life and spread joy both spiritual and material.

Whatever the nature or the system of government may be, the two essentials—work and compassion—make for prosperity and true happiness. A BBC Panorama recently broadcast a lot of important facts about China. Human labour can hardly ever have been employed since the days of the Pyramids with such insect-like profusion as in modern China. "Forty-five thousand Chinese, men and women, toil from sunrise to sunset on the building of a new dam, and they do it all without any kind of earth-moving machinery or equipment—in fact practically with bare hands," said Mr. Richard Dimbleby in this BBC programme. "Men and women are working like this all over China," said Mr. Gerald Clark, London editor of the *Montreal Star,* in confirmation of Mr. Dimbleby's statement.

"The same methods of mass, unskilled labour that are putting up these huge twentieth-century earthworks are being employed also in other aspects of the drive for more industrial power," added Mr. Dimbleby.

What are *we* doing? We thirst and hunger for foreign exchange to import machinery and run family planning propaganda, and distribute contraceptives among girls who mix with ardent boys. Manual labour, the tortoise, wins the race in China against the hare, foreign machinery, in India.

"The backyard blast furnace is really the symbol of modern China. It is her industrial revolution, the great leap forward into the twentieth century," said Mr. Gerald Clark.

We in India are planning to invest astronomical figures of rupees in the founding of an atomic power station.

"The Chinese communist philosophy is 'Don't wait for the big factories, use your millions, let industrialization rise in the cottage and the village workshop'," said Mr. Dimbleby in this BBC Panorama. "There are from 3 to 7 lakh backyard furnaces throughout China," confirmed Mr. Gerald Clark.

"Thirty years ago it was Japan that sold cheap consumer goods to the world. Now China is competing with much lower prices, in the markets of South-East Asia," said Mr. Richard Harris of the editorial staff of the London *Times*.

We are constantly and irrelevantly reminded that we are in the atomic age. What has the atom got to do with our progress? Nothing. Our large population of two-handed human beings is relevant and that is either ignored or deemed to be a handicap. In China they use these hands.

May be, it is there done by compulsion and indoctrination. But that is not an essential. Our men *can* and must be made work-minded. Our rulers must be liberated from the machine obsession. If together with this we have the doctrine of trusteeship, that is, of compassion and a sense of reality, we can solve the antinomy of individual and society. We can make a paradise of free men in India.

March 28, 1959 *Swarajya*

FALSE HOPES

NOBODY objects to well managed co-operative stores. What those who have farming experience object to is to the forced co-operative *cultivation* that is in the offing of the Congress talk. Those who raise objections to the adumbrated Congress policy do not object to the principle of co-operation or the *dharma* of

mutual help. Our rulers in Delhi have put on the role of new Marxs and Engels and have begun to talk dialectics, in their hearts staking all hope on State compulsion.

The poor must be looked after. There must be much greater food production. These two problems form the challenge of our time. The answer is not the rousing of class hatred. More toil, more compassion, these are the answers; more love, not hatred, is wanted, and it must be roused by a spiritual effort which Mr. Jawaharlal Nehru is qualified and is in a position to put forth.

The true *Yuga mantra* is work and compassion. Work makes wealth, and compassion distributes it without removing the incentive for work. Expropriation or other compulsion, of whatever nature it may be, kills incentive and thereby acts as a hindrance to work and production. These are simple truths derived from experience. The new Marxism does not realize where it is riding to. The *dharma* that should be revived is—Let us do maximum work, all of us in every station or job: let the well-to-do look on themselves as trustees for their superfluous wealth. These twin principles must now be our *dharma*. Let us do all we can to teach and spread these twin doctrines. They will be like the *bala* and *atibala* that Viswamitra taught Ramachandra. This is the answer to the challenge of our times, not an ineffective and ill-thought-out imitation of what the communists are doing elsewhere. Imitations produce no good results but only ridicule from those whom we imitate and ultimately finish up in the people preferring the original to the copy.

We are not objecting to real and plain co-operation which is true only if voluntary. What people object to is to the violation of the Constitution which guaranteed freedom of avocation and the right to earned wealth and property.

No one objects to co-operation among those who wish to do it with their own properties, if they find it more profitable

than independent management. What is objected to is to the idea that what has been someone's property should be made some other people's property, whether it is to be held in co-operation or otherwise. What people feel is that this is a violation of the Constitution and that the net result of it will be both injustice and a drop in production.

The issue of farming practice, whether personal proprietory cultivation will yield better results or whether organizational management will (in our country) result in higher production, is a question of fact. Co-operation of villagers and management by a secretary or committee, elected or accepted by them, is not the same thing as a high grade technical corporation with tractors and modern equipment managing a large tract of virgin land and bringing it under the plough with the help of big capital and science. A rural co-operative organization in our countryside cannot be very different from what we have seen in many experiments that have been already made, especially in the South where much more earnest efforts were made in such directions than in other parts of India. In any case, such a policy can be subjected to trial and error, although error in this case means serious fall of food production. This must be remembered by lovers of doctrine. Experiments might however be made and lessons learned afresh.

But expropriation cannot be tolerated. So far nothing has been said about compensation in connection with ceilings; nor has anyone thought about the consequences of private investments on land being liquefied into cash or Government bonds, and the impact of it on inflation, which is already a matter of concern.

There is an unreal and indirect way of dealing with issues which want of courage tempts people into. Those who object to ceilings on landed property think it is good tactic to say, let there be ceilings on all kinds of income. The extension of an error is not an answer to a wrong policy. Again they attack the co-operative farming that is proposed for the land to be taken away

from its lawful owner instead of protesting against the illegal invasion on rights which are protected by the law of the land. If someone proposes to rob a woman of her jewellery and melt it down into gold, is she to be arguing with the man about the infrugality of that procedure on the ground that it would be better he retains them as jewels ? This is just what those who do not want to be robbed of their land are now doing. They object to its being put by government under co-operative cultivation instead of objecting to the expropriation itself. These indirect attempts to stem the tide of tyranny will serve only to confuse real issues.

What should most severely be objected to is the policy of spreading class hatred by rousing false hopes among the wage-earning poor and setting them up against the few who possess some property. Socialism should in this age, when we have so much past experience to teach us, be not allied to policies that breed class hatred. It is easy to raise votes on hatred but that is not good government nor the way to raise prosperity or increase the quantum of food-grains that come into the urban markets. Means should be found for making people happy. Rousing hatred is not the way. The satisfaction born of hatred is not happiness. Hatred has a way of getting out of hand even if it be under government management.

April 4, 1959 *Swarajya*

WELFARE THROUGH WORK

WORK (*Udyog*) and Compassion (*Daya*) should be the two guiding principles for the greater production and the better distribution of national wealth. A movement of indoctrination of these two duties of life must be initiated for national progress and replace

the plans for extinction of incentive by a socialist state seeking to establish a costly and wasteful bureaucracy in the place of individual ownership.

Udyog is honest labour for reasonable hire and not any scheme of volunteers offering to do 'honorary' work. Honorary work has resulted in the vested interest of people following no self-supporting occupation claiming the right to govern the country and to tyrannize over all the people who function in one way or another in the production of real wealth.

Every labourer is worthy of his wage and any attempt to get men to work without paying them a wage leads to fraud and corruption. The Deputy Secretary's wage, or the wage of the man who cleans a drain or clears the silt of a tank or channel is all of the same worthy quality and should not be grudged. It does not help the nation to get men to offer to work without payment. Such work will be found to be either not honest or not lasting and not profitable to the community.

It is the duty of everyone to work to maximum capacity and he is entitled to take his fair wage. There should be no idle hands and good government consists in furnishing the opportunity for this honest toil.

The duty to work includes the duty to work hard and not deceive the community by shirking or pretending. If we wish to fight national poverty we must work to our utmost capacity as soldiers fight with utmost bravery. The spirit of true work, *Udyog*, dispenses with supervision except for proper guidance and co-operation.

Wealth will be produced in abundance if this principle is universally assimilated and made a part of conscience. This applies to all levels of work from the topmost to the lowest strata.

The stunt of men who hide their parasitism by offering to work for nothing, 'voluntary' or 'honorary' workers as they are

called, is not going to solve our problems. We want honest coolie work from top to bottom.

All wealth should be subject to the *Dharma* of trusteeship, of *Daya* to maximum capacity. 'Enjoy by giving away. What you possess is *God's* possession. Your ownership is just trusteeship'—this is the teaching which if accepted will make every individual in the nation a king, a ruler, a god. If we wish to preserve our *Swatantra* while reaching out to the goal of general welfare, *Loka Yogakshema*, this and this only is the way. If other ways are adopted, they will lead to the extinction of the one or the other, or probably of both, destroying freedom and not producing general welfare, but the opposite of it, sterile unhappiness.

April 6, 1959 *The Indian Express*

LOST ITS ANCHOR

Conservation is the first law of progress. If change for change's sake is to be condemned, why should people be shy about calling themselves conservative? To conserve is to look after what is good and not to let thoughtless ruin overtake what is essential and good, in a hunt after will-o'-the-wisps.

Britain is not ashamed of being ruled by the Conservatives who openly call themselves by that name. The Labour Party which was for some time called socialist has not attracted all the votes of the poor in Britain. The party now prefers to call itself Labour rather than socialist. I wonder if even in the next election, the socialists of Britain would score over the Conservatives. The poor seem to have greater faith in the latter's good sense than in that of the Labour leaders.

> .... the prevalent high-flown rhetoric which has spread everywhere—phrases such as 'the dawn of the future', 'the building of a new world' . The first time you hear such talk you think 'what breadth of imagination, what richness ! ' But in fact it's so pompous just because it is so unimaginative and second-rate.
>
> —From *Dr. Zhivago*

What the people want is not futile attempts at egalitarianism, but happiness. Freedom and welfare are what they want and what their honest souls hunger for. These cannot be got by cloud formations of vaporous thought. Egalitarianism is the last thing that will bring welfare in a poor country. Freedom is the first and surest casualty in the socialist pattern. Socialism will not bring welfare but result in an all-embracing bureaucracy. Welfare is the last thing to be secured under bureaucracy. What we shall get is waste of resources and the rise into power of a new class or tyrants whose daily function would be the daily interference in private life under various pretexts. Fear will be the air we breathe. If we desire Freedom, *Swatantra,* and not tyranny, if we desire human personality not to be strangled by over-government, if we desire the general welfare of the poor to be uplifted and looked after, we must have a conservative party whose function will be to restrain and guide the ruling party, if not to replace it. The ruling party has lost its anchor and in its nervous fear of the communists, itself offers to become communist.

The nation and its welfare are like the total crop of a country, its quality and measure. The total is in both cases just an arithmetical idea. The individual seeds must germinate, receive water and sunlight, and grow. So also the individuals among the people of a country must be good, active and grow in freedom so that the total of the individuals, the nation, may turn out to be good, active and progressive. We can make flour out of corn ; but if we grind the corn into flour, and sow it, no amount of watering or manuring or sunlight can make it grow. Grinding the individuals down into a common mass would result in just

the same total sterility. This is a universal law. The whole cannot be better than its parts. The parts must live so that the aggregate may be a worthy whole with life throbbing in it. Take care of the seed and the crop will take care of itself. It would be foolish to seek to raise a great ready-made crop of corn-flour. The patriot therefore watches himself, guards his freedom and his life. It is in the individual that the nation lives and grows, not in statistics or government literature wherein figures are collected and exhibited.

April 11, 1959 *Swarajya*

WELFARE WITHOUT FREEDOM?

According to an eminent American professor of sociology reason has not fared well in the present 'post-modern' age. The sway of bureaucracy, he says, has replaced moral sensibility. "The moral insensibility of our times was made dramatic by the Nazis. But was not the same lack of human morality," he asks, "revealed by the atomic bombing of the peoples of Hiroshima and Nagasaki ? "

What he deplores is according to him, happening both in the U.S.S.R. and the U.S.A. In the over-developed countries the standard of living dominates the style of life. The inhabitants are possessed (as it were) by the industrial and commercial apparatus. Collectively and individually there is a frenzied pursuit of commodities. Life, labour and leisure are all organized around the fetishes of production and consumption. A panic for status prevails corresponding to the proddings of poverty in under-developed countries. Society has become 'a great sales-room and a net work of rackets'. Anxious obsolescence has become the way of life.

The world of antagonism between the U.S.S.R. and the U.S.A. has produced similarities between them. Both are super-societies wherein the power of both is based upon technological development which is made into a cultural and social fetish, and is not an instrument under public control. In both, men at leisure and at work are subjected to impersonal bureaucracies. In both, the political order is enlarged and centralized. The political order becomes less and less political and more and more bureaucratic.

The two-party State, this professor has posed, can be as irresponsible as a one-party State. There is no vehicle in the over-developed State for reasoned opinions, no instruments for the national exertion of public will. This is how this professor paints the situation in America as well as U.S.S.R.

The picture may perhaps be deemed, he says, a biassed view. But, he asks, what good is it to provide a 'balanced view' which is usually a vague equilibrium between platitudes ? In this post-modern age, the professor says, we face the possibility of the deterioration of the human mind in quality and cultural level, hidden by the accumulation of technological gadgets, those who use them not understanding them, and those who invent and maintain them not understanding much else. The privileged men, the intellectuals of post-modern society, do not meet the challenge, he says, with moral passion and intellectual energy and are guilty of the greatest human default of our times.

Yet this is the pattern of progress we are after in India, too. The craze for imitative adventure, to do the things that are done in the over-developed countries, has seized the political leadership of our country, falsifying the hope of the Father of the Nation that we might work out a future according to our own genius and not run after what has proved to be a will-o'-the-wisp where the hunt has been fully carried out.

State compulsion, direct and indirect as a substitute for people's character, and the expansion of the size and function of

the bureaucratic machine—these are supposed to usher in paradise. Communism is anathema, but all the same it is the pattern of communism we are asked to work out for our happiness.

Neither capitalism nor socialism can produce happiness. Our national poverty should not mislead us into false values. We must raise ourselves materially without losing individual freedom or the spiritual values which are basic for all real progress and true happiness. Western capitalism and Western socialism worship the same gods. They kneel at the same altar. In addition, socialism, be it Fabian or Marxist, believes in concentrating power in the State and utilizing that power over every individual.

Gandhiji too had an *'ism*. His *'ism* can be briefly described as the *'ism* of trusteeship—that everyone who holds a position or owns property should hold and look after it as trustee for all those who can benefit from it ; a trader should be a trustee for his customers, a farmer should be a trustee for his family and his tenants and for the community at large, and so on in every case. The social and moral rule of trusteeship should replace the State compulsion involved in socialism or communism. This social doctrine of holding what you hold as a trustee for others is not a new conception. It is as old as our *sastras* :

एष पन्था मयोद्दिष्टो येन यान्ति महर्षयः ।

as Visvamitra said to Sri Rama when he asked him which way to take to cross the sandy Sone river : " I want you to go along the path the *Maharshis* have shown. "

Modern civilization has greatly increased the number of situations which this sacred relationship of trusteeship must govern. Every human action, no matter how intimate and personal, is affected with a public interest, and attracts this principle of trusteeship. The doctrine of enlightened selfishness of the

nineteenth century utilitarians should be refined into a doctrine of immanent trusteeship.

The means to reach this end should not be compulsion but a refinement of the moral sense by education and religion. *Dharma* is the single word that sums up what we require. Religion cannot be pigeon-holed but should be woven into every activity of life, including social and public activities. The time calls for a great spiritual movement. We need more work, intense and honest work, so that more wealth may be produced and we need to spread *dharma* so that what we produce may be spread out into general welfare and happiness.

It is not necessary to alter the producing machinery in order that others may share in the benefit. Every person should work to his full capacity, but every person should deem himself to be a trustee all the same.

This will preserve freedom while producing welfare. Welfare produced under expropriatory laws robs us of freedom, if indeed it is welfare at all to live under an omnipotent bureaucracy with tentacles running into private lives. You own what you own, but remember that the best way to enjoy it is to look after it as a trustee for others. This social and moral doctrine must be strenuously inculcated. This is the true non-violent way to national welfare without the incubus of a socialist bureaucracy.

Is it a feasible plan ? Let us remember that all the religions of the world have idealized this way of life. If only we do not wreck the spiritual work of the past by thoughtless attacks on the foundations of that work, we can build thereon more effectively and more rapidly than we may imagine it to be possible. Conscience is a part of the human organism as developed by evolution according to Adam Smith, Charles Darwin, Alexander Bain, Freud and all the eminent psychologists of the world and it has, according to them all, grown out of sympathy and imagi-

nation—putting oneself in the place of other people and feeling what they feel. What we can achieve through this conscience is what we really achieve. Any other means adopted for accomplishing what can truly be accomplished only by appealing to conscience and spiritual values, nullifies the accomplishment. It would rob society of its priceless possession, *viz.*, individual freedom, and convert achievement into a mirage.

The laws of government have a great deal of legitimate work to do—to prevent exploitation, fraud or oppression without entering the positive field of actually doing what individuals alone can do frugally and with zeal. Within tolerance limits the government may levy taxes for its purposes but not attempt to do with tax-money what companies and individuals have been doing with their capital. Society must depend ultimately on the impulses of the spirit which move people to do good and not levy taxes for doing it all themselves, substituting compulsion for love and compassion and gradually starving out these impulses.

April 18, 1959 *Swarajya*

LET US CLARIFY OUR AIMS

If as it appears from the latest speech of the Prime Minister during his Southern tour he is firmly of the view that any attempt at socialistic equalization is premature and that the immediate task is to increase production, it follows that he must withdraw the now adumbrated land policies.

First, why ceilings of any kind on landholdings now? Are the larger landowners in India burning up farm-produce to keep prices up? Or are they with the same immoral object leaving

good land unploughed, which if given to others could add to the food-grains production? What advantage is it from the point of view of production to transfer ownership now from those who have capital and credit to those who have neither?

The talk about ceilings has created an illusory hope among the poor that they will all get land and become landowners too. But the illusion can last only as long as the suggestion is not put in force. The moment it is put into effect it will be seen that, as a result of the unconstitutional dispossessions, there is really not enough for distribution among the landless and the net result is only an increase in the national debt, and jealousies and factions between those who benefited and those who were disappointed.

Secondly, why should individual attention be terminated in favour of corporate holding and crowd-responsibility? Will there be scope or facility for the introduction of mechanized techniques of production by extinguishing the present traditional pattern of farming and by experimenting with collectivization in one shape or another in the matter of rice-production? Co-operative stores purchase, co-operative selling, co-operative credit, all these are good and well known. But why co-operative farming? Has it been proved anywhere in India that this has increased production, which is the single issue we have to tackle now?

Has the Government done all it can in the agricultural department to help the farmers with credit and the other things they need? Will not better results be got if State assistance is given to the individual farmers, instead of striking at the root of individual responsibilty and personal interest?

These are the points to be considered without prejudice or pride being allowed to confuse the issues. Let us first solve the problem of insufficient food production, before we take up the social issue of how to distribute property more equitably and

usefully. Let us not add to the prevailing widespread uncertainties which are greatly hampering progress and industry. Let us try to give a feeling of security which is essential for the augmentation of incentive and for uprightness in daily conduct. Multiplicity of problems is no excuse for confusion in policy. First things first is a very good rule when we handle the aftairs of a vast population.

April 25, 1959 *Swarajya*

A TIME FOR RE-THINKING

Now that Mr. John Foster Dulles is out of the way it is time the nations re-think some fundamentals. Do they believe in co-existence? Indeed, do they realize that there is no other way for nations to live? They do, but they do not give up hating. They believe they cannot. With hatred prodding one from behind as with a sharp spear, co-existence becomes a way of pain, not a way of life. They must realize the contradiction and give up the one or abandon all hope for the other.

The nations do not want war; yet their governments believe in going as near the brink as possible and threatening to make war. This again is a contradiction that makes for waste, frustration and aimlessness of policy.

People with considerable military experience have confirmed that nuclear strategy has failed. Still nuclear strategy sets the pattern for politics instead of policy laying down the plan for military strategy, a rule still believed in as valid.

If the NATO Powers decided that the third world war was essential to their existence and, therefore, planned systematically to start it at the next favourable moment, the behaviour of their

politicians would be intelligible. This was the case with German policy under Hitler. Hitler wanted war and therefore, without any contradiction, he subordinated policy to strategy. He wanted war as an end in itself. He substituted war-planning for *laissez faire* and psychological warfare for normal negotiation.

But Hitler's brinkmanship was different from Mr. Dulles's, because Hitler had decided to go over the brink at the right time, whereas NATO wants to avoid war at any cost. The West dreads actual hostilities but yet believes in walking on the brink. The West sacrifices democratic foreign policy because NATO defence policy calls for it. The Western Powers regard the Middle East and North Africa not as the homeland of the Arab people but as the northern flank of NATO. 'Undeveloped' countries are strategic vacuums and their Independence a danger that should not be tolerated.

When it comes to the point, no member of the NATO would wage war but would stand out and all of them want the uncommitted nations to get into their cold bloc as if that would benefit anybody. These contradictions must be bravely eliminated as a result of clear thinking.

If we do not want hot war and we are sure about it, there is no point in keeping up the cold war or feeding it as we feed a pig that is intended for pork. Mr. John Foster Dulles's exit can get into history as a turning-point for Western policy, the abandoning of a brinkmanship that was contradicted by a simultaneous firm decision that war should be avoided at any cost, which made it all just folly and waste of mankind's resources using them to poison the world's atmosphere and reversing the processes of natural evolution.

May 1959 *Broadway Times*

CO-OPERATIVE FARMING

Neither food insufficiency nor the population growth is a new phenomenon in our country. Both have been with us these twelve years and long before that too.

We have abolished titles. We have decreed the banishment of the English language and ordered Hindi to take its place. We have driven the *anna* and the *pie* out of the currency and enforced the people to deal with hundred instead of with twelve and sixteen. We have arranged to end the confusion of weights and measures by a total and universal confusion of metric weights and measures. We have changed the names of streets. We have redistributed the provinces and re-aligned the boundaries so as to divide them from one another more effectively and live in passionate parochialism. We have downgraded railway compartments. We have even touched up the calendar. Our weather reports have been shifted from fahrenheit to centigrade. We have changed so many things and we have borrowed a lot of money from abroad. Democracy is running without riots and disturbances, and no one talks about the bribery that is almost openly indulged in.

But these do not seem to have improved the food situation nor affected the growth of population. So we have now a new patent medicine : Co-operative cultivation.

Is this likely to increase production? There is a general scepticism about it. Those who have farming experience doubt the efficacy of substituting individual interest by distributed responsibility and the efficiency of paid officials taking the place of the landlords' attention and experience. But the politicians are firm in their views about agriculture.

Now, co-operation is good up to a point. But there is nothing so good as individual interest to produce the close, constant and intimate attention that lands and crops require. Unless the joint owners are a family of blood relations, or are bound together in some such intimate manner, the responsibility of many becomes the responsibility of no one. This is the loudly expressed view of all those who have dealt with farms.

No slogan for merely re-arranging ownership can solve the over-all quantitative production. Steady and well-considered assistance to individual owners so as to *increase* not decrease the output of working capital to be sunk in land is what is called for, not change of hands by expropriatory laws from those who have capital to those who command neither capital nor credit, and the rousing of unfulfillable mass egalitarian hopes of gifts of landed property. These are good for raising votes, nor for raising food-crops.

In this universe which, as far as science can see, is still a riddle of causeless and endless existence, where we see space and time turn round and move in an infinite curve that meets where it began, no doctrine or remedy is true or valid in the absolute sense. The only way is the humble way of temperance in everything, not to carry anything too far.

This golden rule excludes State-directed collectivization masquerading as co-operation. It excludes the removal of bunds that hold the needed water and mark the ownership where it is necessary. It excludes the wiping out of personal interest, the creative instinct.

The *Bhagavad Gita* with all its idealism lays down the rule of temperance in everything. This rule applies to the principle of co-operation in work also. Co-operation in its simpler forms is a joy. When it is over-done and over-organized, it gets identified with the power of the State. Then it becomes a despotism. The interference of the community becomes a

tyranny. Be it communism, or be it anti-communist rule, the principle of co-operation can, by over-doing, be converted into bitterly resented despotism, obedience being secured by men specially trained to extract it.

The only way worth living is the way that Socrates, Buddha, Christ and the Rshis of India preached, which includes sympathy and helpful co-operation in its hygienic forms and excludes collectivism masquerading as co-operation, which is welcomed by the Communist Party because it adds to its prestige and helps its future strategy and opportunity.

May 2, 1959 *Swarajya*

THE DALAI LAMA

THE flight of the Dalai Lama and the impetuosity of the Chinese attacks on India, and the embarrassments of Mr. Jawaharlal Nehru have come as a windfall to the Western bloc. Every attempt is being made to confirm and underline the slant towards themselves of Indian public opinion. The situation calls for very great circumspection.

If we consider that our neutrality in the world conflict is correct policy, no excitement should be allowed to push us out of that policy. It is far too easy to fly into a passion on particular issues and lose sight of the main battle. Our battle is against the cold war, and not against one or the other of the two blocs. If we serve or let ourselves be used to feed the cold war, we lose the battle wherein we have so far been victorious and wherein our neutral policy has extorted appreciation from our previous detractors. Our neutrality is firmly based on a balanced

appreciation of the whole position in the world and we should not be elocutionized out of that policy. Tibet is smaller than the world. We should not fall into the error of being attracted to either side of the cold war, believing that we have been appointed keeper of our brother.

The Dalai Lama must continue as our honoured guest. He probably can never return to his country after what has happened and after his admitted advances to Peking. But he can make himself more and more a spiritual leader of Buddhism and less and less of a Tibetan leader. Buddhism is a field of vast potency and in India he can shape himself into a world figure and serve mankind and through that service, serve Tibet also.

May 9, 1959 *Swarajya*

THE LEVIATHAN

In a recent third-programme BBC broadcast, Professor Wright Mills of Columbia University has given a lead to the intellectuals of all nations who have generally come to differ from their governments but who at the same time feel impotent to do anything by way of putting their own views into political effect. The great world-issue of today, on which intellectuals in most countries differ from their governments, is about the cold war. The intellectuals see no rationality in the policy of an unending fear and the search for an impossible security. But they are unable to go into a political battle against their governments. The intellectuals, therefore, simply withdraw from political life and believe it is the only thing they can conscientiously do.

Professor Wright Mills speaks the language of Thoreau and Socrates and Gandhiji and says to them : "Your withdrawal from

politics, I am sorry to point out, is itself a political act. Your political inactivity does not save you from the offence of being accomplices. Whatever your intentions may be, in effect you assist the Powers that be in their wrong course."

The professor's advice is that although a direct party struggle is not possible for the intellectuals, they should personally persist. They should become international again. They personally must refuse to fight the cold war. They must attempt to get in touch with their opposite numbers in all countries of the world—above all, those in the Sino-Soviet zone of nations. With them, they ought to make their 'own separate peace'.

The professor insists that no one may conceive himself as an altogether private person, or accept impotence, or a position tantamount to fatalism. Refuse in your own person to do or say what you do not approve in conscience, he says. "If you refuse to do it, others may refrain from doing it, and those who still do it may then do it only with hesitation and with guilt. To refuse to do it is an affirmation of yourself as a moral centre of responsible decision. It would be the act of a man who rejects fate. It would reveal the resolution of at least one human being to take his own fate into his own hands."

Professor Wright Mills says the 'intellectuals', who are a wide group of thinking men, are guilty of the 'greatest human default being committed by privileged men in our times'. If this be so, what about the intellectuals of the future, asks a correspondent commenting on the professor's statement. What chances have they got? The same agencies which are making the cheerful robots—the bureaucracies, he points out, are inevitably controlling the processes of education. There will be no place for thinking men in the societies of the future, in the 'rational' schemes envisaged by the bureaucracies who are constructing future societies. This is happening, he says, as much in 'Western' societies as in the communist societies. Educated people are not wanted, but only 'trained' people!

How relevant all this is to certain things that are happening in our own country ! The intellectuals in our country have for some time past been overwhelmed and hypnotized into silence and dismal fatalism by the steam-roller policies of the Congress. These have in Professor Wright Mills's BBC broadcast a very stimulating re-emphasis of what Gandhiji taught and which they seem to have so soon forgotten. It might help them to resume their duties to the public. Those farmers and landowners who command intellect and possess the needed capital besides farming experience can learn much from this re-emphasis of the principles that enabled Gandhi to do what he did. We should not be afraid of the steam-rollers. We should be loyal to our convictions and give full expression in our own person each of us of our own conscience without fear of the Leviathan.

May 16, 1959 *Swarajya*

TIME TO WAKE UP

News that may be considered pointing towards danger is coming out. We should not be surprised if in the near future China makes up her mind to drop her patience with Formosa and act on the assumption that it will not lead to a world war if she exercises her national rights to put an end to the armed camp against her mainland maintained by Chiang Kai-shek. It is now well understood that the great nuclear Powers are not so eager to join in any local war as they may make it appear by way of deterrence. There is a definite cleavage of opinion in America itself about the maintenance for all time of the army of Chiang Kai-shek. Enough respect has been shown to old loyalties that are no longer consonant with established facts. If it comes to the actual opening out of a nuclear war America would hesitate a great deal before plunging the world into it.

Even if the conflict between China and Formosa were to be successfully localised, the use of second class atomic weapons by America and American-aided forces on the side of Formosa is sufficient to poison the atmosphere for all of us who are not involved and have a right to our health and the normalcy of our children. It must be seriously and fully examined whether the authority of any world organization may be duly and formally invoked in time by uncommitted India and Burma and Ceylon to prevent any nuclear power exploding, or assisting the explosion, of nuclear weapons of any sort to the prejudice of the health of the peoples of India, Burma or Ceylon. We cannot let things go on until it becomes too late.

This is an issue different from the issue of test explosions. The use of nuclear weapons of any grade on the Chinese coast is likely to result in the adding of poisonous fall-out in greater quantities than even by the test explosions that have been the subject matter of anxiety so far.

America cannot refuse to accept the jurisdiction of world courts or other world authorities. The Government of India has to take up this matter without delay in view of the active preparations of offence and defence reported in that area. America cannot be allowed to put into practice her theory that certain atomic weapons have now to be treated as 'conventional'. Scientists have made it clear that an extensive use of these weapons on the battlefield as a part of even a local war is enough to produce a terrible amount of radio-active poison that cannot be limited to operate only on the belligerents.

The time has arrived for non-belligerents to wake up from their lethargy, to throw off the hypnotism of brutal power that is suppressing them and to show some warlike energy of the peaceful kind.

May 16, 1959 *Swarajya*

UNREPENTANT TRUMAN

In an interview article by Mr. Cabell Phillips in *The New York Times* (May 3), we read that ex-President Truman is unashamed about the dropping of the atom bombs on Nagasaki and Hiroshima. " To me it was a weapon of war, an artillery weapon. We faced half a million casualties trying to take Japan by land. It was either that or the atom bomb, and I didn't hesitate a minute."

And he added : " I've never lost any sleep over it since."

We know, however, that America has lost some sleep over it ever since ! The law of *Karma* has worked relentlessly and Truman's atom bomb has grown into the sleepless nightmare that it is now for all the good people of Truman's country.

Mr. Harry Truman seeks to justify his act. But Mr. Churchill's narrative is fairly conclusive on the point. After setting out all the facts, he winds up : " It would be a mistake to suppose that the fate of Japan was settled by the atomic bomb. Her defeat was certain before the first bomb fell and was brought about by overwhelming maritime power. Her metropolitan army had capitulated without striking a blow. Her shipping had been destroyed."

The message sent by the Emperor of Japan to Stalin said, according to Mr. Churchill, "that Japan could not agree to what was then called ' unconditional surrender ', which included the handing over of the Emperor as a war criminal but *Japan was prepared for admission of defeat and cessation of war.*"

Now, as I said in my speech at the YMCA, Madras in March 1955, Mr. Churchill is not a negligible authority in such a matter.

But from the horse's mouth, so to say, we have a very relevant passage in the book of Fleet Admiral William D. Leahy, Chief of Staff to President Roosevelt and President Truman, a book that was published with a foreword by President Truman in October 1949 :

> It is my opinion that the use of this barbarous weapon on Hiroshima and Nagasaki was of no material assistance in our war against Japan. The Japanese were already defeated and ready to surrender ...... It was my reaction that the scientists and others wanted to make this test because of the vast sums that had been spent on the project. Truman knew that, and so did the other people involved. However the Chief Executive made a decision to use the bomb on two cities in Japan. 'Bomb' is the wrong word to use for this new weapon. It is not an explosive. It is a poisonous thing that kills people by its deadly radio-active reaction more than by the explosive force it develops. My own feeling was that in being the first to use it, we had adopted an ethical standard common to the barbarians of the Dark Ages There is a practical certainty that potential enemies will develop it in the future and that atomic bombs will some time be used against us.
>
> (pp. 441, 442 in *I Was There* by William D. Leahy.)

May 16, 1955 *Swarajya*

COLD WAR AND THE DALAI LAMA

It is difficult to be neutral in the cold war. But it is even more difficult to look after the safety of the Dalai Lama's life without appearing to keep him as a prisoner. At least it seems so, if we take the slanders of certain foreign papers seriously. Everyone knows that the people of India and the Government of Mr. Nehru, as well as Mr. Nehru himself personally, do not like to circumscribe the activities of the Dalai Lama in any manner. But enjoying asylum in a neutralist country is different from the same

thing if it is in one of the countries fighting the cold war on one side or the other. The danger of an outrage is greater in India than in more isolated countries, for reasons which are obvious; and security precautions have therefore to be heavier in India than they would have to be if, for instance, the Dalai Lama were in England. People with hostile intentions can enter India far more easily than other countries abroad.

India is not responsible for the Dalai Lama preferring to be in a country sanctified by Buddhist tradition, although the Americans and the British would like to have him in their territory as a prize refugee from communist oppression. India cannot help this preference of the Dalai Lama. We must blame Buddha and the traditions around Gaya and Saranath, we must blame Asoka and many others who are all beyond the pale of the cold war for the Dalai Lama preferring to stay in India instead of accepting the attractive invitations of America or any of her NATO allies. He could no doubt be more comfortable there.

But if the pontiff of Tibet makes the mistake of going to America, there is an end to any prospect of rehabilitation, slight as it is even now. Mr. Lama will become a good and perfect American and paradoxically Tibet will be more speedily communized. Nothing would please Peking and Moscow more than the departure of the Dalai Lama to America. It is hoped he will resist the temptation in the interests of his people and his country.

Meanwhile, let there be no doubt that all the slander about the illustrious refugee being held or treated as a prisoner in India is as false as any other interested fabrication and should not be allowed to mislead anyone in the world. It is just a part of the frustration of cold war journalists.

The reckless and unwanted use of atom-power over Hiroshima and Nagasaki has by its chain reaction produced a state of things which now makes it impossible for any big Power going to the

assistance of any small nation in trouble. As long as America and Britain are not prepared for a nuclear war, it is immoral for them to seek to exploit the trouble in Tibet merely for adding to the cold war fumes. The straightforward course would be to admit China into the UNO and recognize her Government and negotiate for justice to Tibet.

May 23, 1959 *Swarajya*

FREE *VS.* HIRED SCIENCE

It is fourteen years now since the United States exploded the first A-bomb over Japan with deadly effect and six years have passed after the first H-bomb was exploded by America by way of test for use in war. Since then there has been grave anxiety throughout the world. A great big cloud of unspeakable dread has been hanging over mankind these many years. The cloud is not just melancholy poetic imagery but carries strontium 90 and carbon 14 which spell inevitable disease and death and deformity for generations.

Free science on the one hand and hired science, on the other, have been issuing statements about the effects of the fall-out, the one explaining the great danger of it, and the other minimizing it as far as scientific jargon can do it.

The battle still continues but the issue can be reduced to simple terms for the common man. Apart from the unreliability of hired evidence, there is this plain question : when something is so dangerous as the free scientists of great eminence have prognosticated, should governments be given the benefit of the doubt, as we do, with criminals in law courts? Should not the benefit

of doubt be given to mankind? Should the nuclear Powers be allowed to go on adding danger to danger, simply because it is not conclusively and quantitatively established that each instalment of danger is a substantial addition? There can be only one answer to this, that the benefit of the doubt should be given to the world and mankind and that civilization should be saved from probable disaster.

The National Academy of Sciences of the U.S.A. published their report in 1956, according to which all radiation, no matter how slight, was harmful genetically—that is, would cause deformity in future generations. It said that relatively small doses might be *physiologically*, that is, directly and to the present generation, harmful, but that the amount of radiation in 1956 was too small to cause physiological as distinguished from genetical damage.

Physiological effects are diseases caused by the radio-active poison such as leukemia and other dreadful forms of illness. Genetical effects are the mutations caused on the regenerative cells resulting in deformed children and grandchildren. The hired scientists have been doing their best to minimize the physiological danger and to ignore the genetical danger. The biologists have been protesting.

The U.S., Russia and Britain have up to now exploded by way of tests more than 200 A and H bombs and these Powers are programming to explode more bombs unless an agreement is reached on the cessation of these tests.

The hired scientists ignore the inescapable genetic effects and concentrate on underlining the ratio of 'natural' radiation to what was so far produced by test explosions, and maintain that the latter is much less than the former and therefore it is unreasonable to ban the explosions which are necessary to develop new weapons. Their arguments are all based on what is statistically obtained as 'world averages'.

In March last, America was much disturbed to learn that these 'world averages' were misleading and that concentrated doses, much above the world average, might descend on particular areas and cause very heavy damage that bore no relation to what was academically worked out on the 'world average' basis. A series of government reports were released by the Joint Congressional Committee on Atomic Energy which indicated that more fall-out for some reason descended on the U.S. than had been calculated. This information alarmed the good people of America. It had been long known that the Japanese area suffered terribly from the effects of the drifting down of radio-active fall-out. But much more interest was evoked on this point of erratic concentration when it was found that the U.S. itself had a larger share of it than the world average. A further enquiry was, therefore, ordered, resulting in what has been called a 'reassuring' report, again stressing the small ratio of fall-out radiation to radiation from other causes.

A very recent report from Bonn said that radio-activity in West German rain water was found to be sixty times the maximum permissible concentration for drinking water. Water from the Rhine was nearly twice above the safety figure set by the European atomic agency.

It is forgotten or ignored that the addition of even small amounts of avoidable radiation to that received from natural sources can be physiologically dangerous to individuals. And it remains uncontradicted that all radiation, small or big, is genetically harmful and there is no question of a tolerance threshold at all there. The American National Academy's clear verdict given three years ago stands unrefuted, that *all* radiation is *genetically* harmful—that is, future generations will suffer as a result of these test explosions. This aspect is ignored in the 'reassuring' statements of hired scientists.

All conferences organized to discuss this situation so far have been 'dialogues of the deaf', as so aptly described by someone.

Every delegate goes with a rigid mandate that blocks the ear. The dialogues will become real when the nations *not involved* in the cold war but who are as much concerned in the question of the dissemination of poison as any of the belligerents, also join in the discussion. But so far international energy in this direction has been conspicuous by its absence.

The health of the world is the real issue but that issue is pushed out by the issues of security and mistrust as between the cold war blocs.

May 30, 1959 *Swarajya*

DOCTRINE OF TRUSTEESHIP

It is not only capitalism and communism that worship the same gods, but socialism too kneels at the same altar of industrialization and, what is more, like communism believes in utilising the power of the State over every individual.

What was Gandhiji's '*ism*?

His '*ism* can be briefly described as the 'ism of trusteeship : everyone who holds a position, and everyone who owns property, should hold them as trustees for all those who have dealings with them and for the community at large. If you are a trader you are a trustee for your customers ; if you own land you are a trustee for your family, for your tenants and for the community; and so on, in every case.

Trusteeship imposes a duty 'to act according to the high standards which a man of the most delicate conscience and the nicest sense of honour might impose upon himself'. (I am quoting from a judge's definition of duty.)

This social doctrine of trusteeship is not a new conception. It is as old as all our *sastras* and it is this same conception that is involved in the biblical injunction to be merciful to your beasts. "A righteous man regardeth the life of his beast" (*Proverbs* 15-10), i.e., he should regard himself as a trustee of his oxen's lives and health. Modern civilization with its complexities has greatly increased the number of situations which this sound relation of trusteeship must govern. Every human action, no matter how intimate and personal, is affected with a public interest and 'attracts' the principle of trusteeship. The outdated but obstinate doctrine of enlightened selfishness should be substituted by this doctrine of immanent trusteeship.

As for the means to make men follow this as a way of life, Gandhiji's example as well as precept may be summed up in the word *dharma*. He never approved of pigeon-holing religion. The spiritual must weave itself into every material activity of life, including social and public life. Institutions to spread doctrine did not appeal to him. Influence must move from person to person and so the good life must spread itself. William James's words may be recalled : "I am done with great things and big things, great institutions and big success, and I am for those tiny, invisible, molecular moral forces that work from individual to individual creeping through the crannies of the world like so many soft rootlets, or like the capillary oozing of water, yet which, if you give time, will rend the hardest monuments of man's pride."

This may at first sight appear to be a long road. But it is not really so long as that, if we remember that all the religions of the world have shaped the way of life of all the nations of the world in this very direction. If but we do not wreck the spiritual achievements of the past by thoughtless attacks on their foundation, we can build thereon more effectively and more rapidly than we may imagine it to be possible, following the advice given by William James.

STATE AND AGRICULTURE

MEGALOMANIA vitiated our planning. The inherent errors are showing themselves in heavy and distressing measure. Mr. Nehru sees India

standing on the top of golden hours
And human nature seeming born again.

But some of us standing with our feet on the ground see differently. We see bankruptcy in the horizon and the sorry picture of Bharat as a chronic beggar before the Western nations. We are distressed. Large dreams are no consolation for present calamity.

The most urgent single problem of the day is the deficit in food production, the basic necessity of any vast population. The compulsory transfer of land from the large owners to cultivators who have to begin with debt, and the switch-over from individual interest to multiple ownership and multiple management through a new bureaucracy with subsidies and interest-free loans, and looking up to Government for solution at every juncture—all these will lead to an immediate fall in production at a time when we can ill afford any fall, and are actually wanting a considerable increase at once.

The Plans have accentuated the rise in prices all round before starting to give expected returns. The policy of acquisition of land to satisfy the policy of multiple ownership *will add to the inflation* : because, unless the intention is to expropriate the present owners, discarding the principles enunciated in the Constitution, money will have to be issued to meet the demand for compensation, either from Nasik or by bonds which will add to the inflation. We cannot have a big policy of converting land into money without this consequence. If this is also accom-

panied by a fall in food production, we can imagine the resulting rise in prices.

State interference is definitely to be deprecated in the field of agriculture which is essentially an industry depending on intimate personal interest. The legitimate function of the State and the only sane policy in this field would be to create and stimulate those *natural* forces which would automatically result in increased personal interest and increased attention. Direct governmental or bureaucratic activity can never produce what can be produced only by the stimulation of natural human urges. Much can certainly be done by stimulation of natural forces, but instead we have a dogmatic policy of State interference in full swing. The interference will damage the delicate and sensitive roots of this not very paying industry, so far maintained by force of tradition and the pressure of poverty.

The present owners of land, big or small, ask for no subsidy and the good prices that foodgrains are now fetching act as an incentive. But now the atmosphere of total uncertainty created by Government policies, and forecasts of future legislation, have destroyed all interest in agriculture among those who otherwise would have greatly helped.

Nothing can be more foolish than the attempt to do State trading in food-grains. There is no justification for the exaggerated fears about hoarding and cornering; because we have such a large body of people engaged and eager to share and compete in the business of wholesale and retail trade. This competition is ample security for the consumer. The bulky nature of the commodity, and its vulnerability to deterioration and attacks of moths and rodents, prevent hoarding. Free competition is not only the best but the most efficient safeguard for the consumer.

Before we plant industries that could absorb a large mass of people, it is wrong to extinguish self-employment and quiet distribution of income which the retail trade does.

Inteterence with competition will increase the very evils we seek to prevent. If we watch the prices in the free market we can see how vigilant and sensible and how just the people are, who are engaged in the big as well as the small business of the distribution of commodities produced in our country. It is a crime to seek to extinguish the retail shopmen. State trading will put ever so many people out of employment, who are doing the work of distribution on the most frugal terms.

We read daily about astronomical figures of money required to be raised in order to relieve unemployment. Taxation will lead to retrenchment in all producing and distributing centres. Taxation will be digging a bigger pit to fill up smaller pits.

Mr. Sripati Chandrasekhar has contributed an interesting article which has appeared in *The New York Times* of May 17 about how Mao is waging war against the family in China. These stories, true or false, about China had little interest to us. But now that the Government of India is on the same road, these surveys of China fill us with fear. We must protect the farm and the family against the totalitarian inroads of the State. An Opposition to the present Government based on this policy of Farm-and-Family-Protection is essential. The farm and the family are the institutions that hold the freedom of the citizen. To imagine that India can be administered as a family can be, and that a socialistic secular bureaucracy can take the place of the parent or the peasant, or of the moral sense of people, is pure illusion. From out of that illusion will issue the greatest danger to democracy, 'socialism' based on force, 'welfare' based on compulsion instead of religion and morality, happiness based on material instead of spiritual values.

June 6, 1959

Swarajya

FOULING WORLD'S ATMOSPHERE

In a leading article last week *The Indian Express* roundly exposed the fallacy of justifying error and opposing wise counsel in the name of the atomic age. The nuclear weapons have posed, it is true, a problem before the human race as a whole, but sputniks and space flights are an absolute irrelevance in our problems of national welfare. To refer to them is only to confuse and confound the public.

The 'burning lust of ambition for great things' misleads men, and fallacies take the place of reason. Leaving aside the irrelevance of quoting the atom and the sputnik in support of an internal policy of expropriation, I again revert to the remarkable fact that the jurists of the world have not taken up seriously the question of the illegality of any government in the world deliberately fouling the world's atmosphere. What right has any nation to do this ? Its difficulties with its own enemy nations can never justify a public nuisance and a dangerous programme of defence leading to world damage and serious danger to the future generations of all mankind. Two thousand seven hundred West German intellectuals including Niemoller, a U-Boat commander, will soon present a memorandum to the Foreign Ministers in Geneva which says :

> "The world must know that the word of the still ruling Chancellor Dr. Konrad Adenaur is no longer the word of the German people. It is the clearly expressed opinion of the majority of the German people that atomic armament does not benefit German or European security but sharpens international tension. The world is united in the demand that there must not be an atomic war."

Science and scientific reports have now lost freedom and are bound up with 'diplomatic reasons' and secrecy—and where the matter is not a petty discovery of commercial value but one affecting the health of vast masses of people, this deterioration in the status of freedom of knowledge and information is a disastrous development in civilization. A news item wired from Rome (June 5) says that radio-activity in the air, water and plants in Italy increased by 20 times during 1957-58 as a result of atomic explosions, according to published figures. The world is recklessly lulled to apathy on the strength of the grossest of fallacies, that each addition is by itself small compared to natural radio-activity—a fallacy on the basis of which we could prove that ant-hills do not exist at all in the world, in as much as each ant can but carry an infinitesimal quantity of clay up. But we have seen ant-hills with our own eyes rising to the height of trees. It seems as if this mischief will not be stopped until a calamity of big dimensions visits one or other of the nuclear Powers by a sudden concentration of undeterminable natural forces. It is sinful to wish for such a thing. But it appears reason will not dawn until such an event happens.

The disaster to mankind that is steadily mounting, like compound interest on debt, is far more of a relevant subject for thought and international action than just furnishing vague exhilaration over the advance of science and the achievements of some nations in sending up trajectiles to previously inconceivable heights, an exhilaration that serves only to confuse one's mind when dealing with national affairs on quite a different plane. "The thermometer has shot up to 113° F. Suffolk has scored 458 runs with only 3 wickets down. Why do you keep singing *Kalyani* instead of *Arabi*, as I want?" It is just this kind of irrelevance that is being indulged in by those who refer to the sputnik age when dealing with questions of increased food production in our farms.

June 13, 1959 *Swarajya*

THE KERALA SATYAGRAHA

WHEN there is a remedy open according to law and the grievance can be brought under examination and remedied, it was not contemplated by Mahatma Gandhi that Satyagraha might be resorted to. Much less justiafible indeed would it be to resort to Satyagraha to reverse the decision of the electorate as to which party should have the governance of the State for the time being. The congressmen of Kerala are laying the axe at the root of parliamentary democracy by what they are doing.

Not only by the test of doctrine, but even as a matter of expediency, the present policy of the Congress in respect of the Government of Kerala is wholly wrong. A million votes may place a party in power in accordance with the Constitution, but twenty thousand men who dislike the decision can create a situation by the methods now employed, under which no government can function without the use of ugly force. And the use of such force will bring in its train passions that will destroy order, and make government impossible.

The slogan of 'non-violence' is irrelevant and serves no purpose in this context. The condition of non-violence is attached to disobedience and non-co-operation, where this is the only way open to one who suffers a wrong. Where the Constitution or the laws provide a remedy, Gandhiji would not tolerate resorting to Satyagraha, and this even in the case of individuals and their grievances. Much stronger would be his objection to parties and groups seeking to seize power by resorting to the methods which he reserved for causes which could not be *otherwise* furthered.

That the Congress organization did not itself accept the responsibility of Satyagraha against the Kerala Government shows

that they smelt something wrong in the process. Permitting congressmen on their own responsibility to do something which the Congress as such could not rightly undertake is an unworthy and unwise evasion. Much better would it be for the Congress to obtain a law from Parliament that where any party other than the Congress wins in any general election, the Governor can order a new election after such time as he thinks fit without awaiting a vote of 'no-confidence' or the expiry of the period fixed for a fresh general election according to the Constitution. Such a law could be easily passed with the Congress majority in Parliament. It might be indecent but it would avoid the disorders we now see in Kerala.

This wrong and short-sighted adventure on the part of Kerala congressmen will have far-reaching evil consequences for the future of parliamentary government in India. Democracy would rest on a feeble foundation if the provisions of the Constitution are to be by-passed by so-called Satyagraha offered by any group that feels strong enough to put sufficient demonstrations in the field. The Constitution contemplates the possibility of peaceful government even on the basis of a majority of one at an election. It would be completely negatived by the doctrine now permitted by the Congress and the Congress Government at the Centre to shake the foundations of the State Government in Kerala.

I do not like the Communist Party but this is not the way to deal with it. It is through the Constitution and the Constitution alone that we should deal with the communists.

The introduction of President's rule now, after all that has happened, would make it appear to be a trick or conspiracy.

June 20, 1959 *Swarajya*

COUNTING THE BEADS

When a Christian, Hindu, Muslim or Buddhist counts the beads in his rosary he does not seek to know the number of beads in the string, for he knows it already. He utters the name of God as taught to him and seeks to feel the Divine proximity and realize His presence. He prays for strength and purification.

The alternative to a rosary is not a hankering or labouring for worldly wealth or visiting a steel factory or textile mill, but some other form of human effort to realize and remember spiritual values over and above material values and their vanities.

God's form is incomprehensible. He exists but we do not know Him. A name is as good as any mental shape that we give to Him.

These observations may seem superfluous to those who missed reading a part of the Prime Minister's recent speech in Nepal wherein he stressed the need for hard work—which he could have done without giving his high authority to the neglect of prayer or spiritual contemplation, and a contemptuous reference to beads and rosaries. Does he not know that the greatest obstacle in national life and national progress today is the fall in moral standards and the widespread diffusion of dishonesty with consequent distrust, and therefore failure of mutual co-operation? We have had enough of destructive forces in the moral field. The need of the hour is a revival of integrity and moral values without which even authoritarian schemes will miserably fail. Does the Prime Minister believe that his own sermons can be as effective as the teachings of ancient faiths and the words of holy men, and be a substitute for the rosary? The rosary and the counting of beads have made man into the human being that he is. Not all the police-

men we can put up in the field can match the strength of religion or be a substitute for it. May the Prime Minister's power and influence be used to raise our people's nature and not to lower it, and reduce them to busy godless serfs, hating and envying one another. It is time the Prime Minister appeals to the people of our land which he seeks to uplift, to repent and lead an honest, compassionate and just life, to give up dishonesty and greed and laziness and be prayerful and lead lives of hard work with God in their hearts, so that we may prosper and be happy and value the things of real value.

It appears as if the Prime Minister believes with the communists that religion is the great opiate that keeps men away from work and it must be discarded. America has not suffered under the opiate. This false proposition has damaged the communist States. All the difficulties they meet with by way of distrust in international efforts to reach agreements can be traced to the proclaimed denial of God and religion on which the communists have anchored their ship of State. It would be a pity if our Prime Minister is unable to rid himself of this fear of religion.

June 20, 1959 *Swarajya*

THE TESTS BAN

A cartoon of *The Daily Express* of London reproduced as top picture in *The New York Times Weekly Review*, puts the case for the urgency of the ban of nuclear tests most incisively. The three nuclear Powers sit under the strontium 90 shower saying there is 'time', 'there is plenty of time' until the drizzle becomes a shower, the shower becomes a flood, and the flood goes over the heads of all the three of them, and only then they lift their hands above the water holding slips of papers saying 'I agree',

'I agree', 'I agree'. Too late it will be, one day, if they go on in the manner they are now doing.

The quantitative estimates of deadly radio-active fall-out hitherto put before the world public, for deluded consumption, were on the basis of world averages. The miseries of the world do not fall on the basis of a uniform spread but come down in concentrated form on particular individuals. So also 90-radio-active strontium and radio-active-carbon, deadly poisons, are sent down by the heavens from the stratosphere bank, not uniformly but heavily concentrated, sometimes here, sometimes there, which science cannot foretell and can do nothing for it even if it foresaw. It has been noticed that surveys in Western countries, the latest being one reported from Italy, show very heavy concentration. American scientist Professor Linus Pauling, 1954 Nobel Laureate for Chemistry, said on June 10 at Copenhagen that we may expect one million cancer cases as a result of radio-activity.

These tests are for making new nuclear weapons which, if used, will shoot fall-out in terrible measure besides killing those who are intended to be the victims. There are deadly H-bombs in stock with both the inveterate enemy blocs, to destroy the world thrice over. The bombs are alive with the Devil in them and they are lying in wait for the zero hour. These tests are for further advance in the same direction.

They are a wholly illegitimate attack on the health of the present and future generations of the uninvolved millions, who have not yet written off their rights in favour of the nuclear pugilists.

The international jurists have said a great deal about Hungary and Tibet. But they do not appear to be excited about this attack on the rights of the peaceful people of the world and their children to be born. No one has referred the question to them !

June 20, 1959 *Swarajya*

THE *KURAL* ON TRUSTEESHIP

To put socialist distribution into force by law before the nation attains prosperity would, as Mr. Nehru recently admitted, amount to distribution of poverty and in fact prevent prosperity. This would be so because we would be killing all incentive for production.

But as and when people make wealth directly for themselves and indirectly for the nation, a certain amount of simultaneous voluntary flow of that wealth from the rich to the poor must be encouraged. And this is what the doctrine of trusteeship means. If Fabian socialists have to admit that their schemes must await prosperity, the Gandhian doctrine does not wait but asks people to treat themselves as trustees of their own wealth for the good of the less fortunate around them.

Those who assert that because men are not angels they cannot be expected voluntarily to help the poor, are casting an unworthy aspersion on our people and on our culture. Innumerable are the memorials all around us of generosity and social co-operation without any legal compulsion. The spirit of charity or, to use a more apt word, the *dharma* of our land has not been an idle or empty slogan. It has always been acted upon and many are the persons who have earned instant and great happiness by the act of giving. They have maintained unbroken the culture of the land in that respect. Gandhiji did not invent or enunciate a new doctrine but it is the genius of the land that spoke through him.

Democracy on the basis of universal adult suffrage is based on the faith we have in our people, literate or illiterate, wise or ignorant. It would be inconsistent with that faith if we refuse to trust those who work and earn their wealth. We must put faith in them and develop moral power enough to make it the rule of life for the wealthy in our land to live as trustees.

Here is a chapter from Tiruvalluvar's *Kural* on the doctrine of *oppuravu* or social co-operation, which is nothing more or less than the Gandhian doctrine of trusteeship. The 22nd chapter of this holy Tamil scripture is worth being rendered fully into English for the benefit of those who cannot read the Tamil book.

What good did the creatures of the earth do to the clouds that pour the rain ? So indeed should you serve society, seeking no return.

Good men put forth industry and produce wealth not for themselves, but for the use of society.

Wealth is not to be earned for the purpose of self-indulgence or for satisfaction of greed. Wealth should be treated as the citizen's instrument for helpfulness. The word *velaanmai* is not just helpfulness, but helpfulness combined with a sense of duty.

There is no pleasure in this or in the other world equal to the joy of being helpful to those around you. Do not lose the opportunity for this rare pleasure.

Man is born as a social being. He alone lives who functions as a social co-operator. He who does not recognize this duty is to be counted as one dead.

When prosperity comes to a man who has understanding and knows his duty to his fellowmen, it is like the village tank that is filled by the rain.

That is to say, it is an occasion for joy for the whole community. The tank keeps the water from running to waste or being dried up, and serves to quench the people's thirst throughout the year.

When wealth comes to a large-hearted man, it is like the village tree coming to be in fruit.

The joy of finding ripe fruit in their own village tree is an apt figure for the prosperity that comes to the large-hearted citizen

to whom it is joy to spread joy around him, for which prosperity brings him the opportunity.

> If wealth comes to one who is blessed with a large heart, it becomes the unfailing medical plant for society's troubles.

The village tank stores the water from running to waste; so the wise citizen acquires and looks after his acquisitions in order to serve all. The village tree bears ripe fruit; even so the liberal-minded citizen freely gives of his wealth to help all around. The medicinal tree is the precious alchemist of nature. Its leaves, bark, fruit and root take out of the earth those essences which relieve ailments of all kinds. So does the wealth of the great citizen serve to relieve suffering of all kinds. His knowledge and experience make up the alchemy that is needed to put the wealth to effective use for the benefit of the community.

> Poverty does not stop the social co-operation of those who have a clear understanding of the duties of life. They continue their social service undeterred by adversity.

It is not necessary to be rich to be helpful. There are ways in which in any position one can help. The essence of social service is in the mind. Under each changed circumstance a new duty arises and the due fulfilment of it is what should be attended to. When, therefore, a man loses his material resources, he does not need to think that his capacity for social co-operation has ceased.

> The worst misery that poverty brings to the large-hearted man is the pain of not having resources enough to serve others in the manner he had been accustomed to

> If social co-operation appears to ruin you, it is indeed worth while to be ruined. You may sell yourself out into slavery if that would enable you to serve the people around you.

There is no price too high to pay for service to society.

June 27, 1959 *Swarajya*

B. C. G. DAY

In spite of the vast number of vaccinations that have been performed with either fresh liquid or freeze-dried vaccine during the past twenty years, there is no scientific evidence of its true value.

—From memorandum No. 324/B C.G. dated Nov. 1953, Health Ministry of U.K.

It should also be borne in mind that in New York City between 1924 and 1944 there was a fall in the death-rate from tuberculosis of nearly 95 per cent without the use of B C.G vaccine

—Dr. J. Arthur Myers : Medical Association Volume 146 No. 16, 1951—page 1492.

THE waste of money on the B.C.G. inoculation programme has been sought to be justified by speeches and writings afresh. I have said and written enough on the subject. This is only to reiterate my view that this B.C.G. is just quackery with organizational drive and nothing else. We can inoculate lakhs of people, because we have power and opportunity and funds and boys can be got at easily enough. But it proves nothing. It gives no benefit. We could utter charms or inoculate with Cooum water and claim that all the men have been saved from the various diseases they are not attacked by, as a result of those charms or that inoculation. Those who have not been yet attacked by T.B. have been free, not because of the B.C.G. They would have been so even without the inoculation.

Let me say, as I have said before, that I am in the company of very eminent doctors when I state that the statistics offered do not prove what is claimed for B.C.G. Because the Government of India has persisted in this waste of money, and in this programme of contamination, let no one imagine that any-

thing has been proved or anything useful has been done. India has been made along with other undeveloped countries a free field for quackery and statistical claims. Inoculation with this bacillus has been so conducted that it proves nothing, except that governments have the facilities to carry on their operations among a docile people who have health enough to resist the artificially introduced contamination. That something is cheaper is by no means proof that it is really of use. A Salem bullock is cheaper than a Sindhi cow, but if we want milk, we cannot get it from the former. Tuberculosis cannot be eliminated by any amount of B.C.G. inoculation. We must spend on bringing into existence pure air, pure water and good nutrition. Mere cheapness is irrelevant. An obstinate government can triumph over logic and science but truth remains what it was, viz., that the way to prevent tuberculosis is through public health activities and nutrition and that the B.C.G. operations only serve to divert attention and cover up the neglect of those real efforts.

June 27, 1959 *Swarajya*

WHAT LENIN DID NOT WANT

"LENIN no longer (1922) wanted to establish the common tillage of soil."—From *Lenin* by David Shub (Ch. 22).

> We have done many stupid things with regard to collective farms. The question of the collective farms is not on the order of the day. We must rely on the individual peasant : he is as he is and will not become different within the near future. Peasants are not socialists, and building socialist plans in the same way as if they were socialists means building on sand. The transformation of the peasant's psychology and habits is something that requires generations. The use of force will not help. The task before us is to influence the peasantry morally. We must

give consideration to the middle peasant. *The efficient peasant* must be the *central figure* of our economic *recovery.*

The italics are Lenin's.

"Building socialist plans in the same way as if they were socialists." These words of Lenin, do they not remind us of the statements often made by the Prime Minister that co-operative farming has been 'enthusiastically' received by the country?

"The use of force will not help," said Lenin. Nor the lavish waste of tax-gathered, precious revenue over the Nehru collective farms. Force is no different from bribes of all sorts. Lenin saw that the psychology of the peasant was something that could not be transformed. It is easy to bribe voters because the casting of votes is quickly done. But attention to land and interest in cultivation—these are not finished at one bribing stroke. The peasant will not be a collectivist once the money is spent. And the money does not pass through his hand. It is spent by an official and the peasant does not receive any warmth from it.

"We must give consideration to the middle peasant. The *efficient* peasant must be the central figure of our economic recovery." The greatest of all Marxists said these words and it is unfortunate that the Indian would-be Marxists have not seen what *he* saw as early as in 1922.

Clear-headed thinking is essential whatever be the creeds adopted. Food production is an issue by itself. It should not be mixed up with other distinct and distant aims.

To prop up a failing dogma public money is proposed to be lavishly thrown away in the form of unsecured loans and interest free subsidies, out of all proportion to the value of land. The widespread and stinging disappointment will come when the yield of the land disappears in repayment of loans and when the administration will recommend writing off what was lent out of tax-payers' money.

The 'ceiling' on land is put forward to deceive the poor and the ignorant. How many of them will share the spoil? And on what basis will the division be made? The wickedness of the illusion that envy is progressive thought or that class hatred is the atomic age will take some time for the poor to see. But can't those who already see it confess before the nation's morality is completely ruined? Interest in agriculture has been brought to a standstill.

This is not the way to increase food production, whatever else it may increase or encourage. We do not allow *sati.* We have no public shaving of young widow's heads. We have no whipping of slave-labourers; what is one to do for sadistic relaxation? So here is a ceiling on land to make some people cry. Useless forms of expropriation are just sadistic relaxations for the electorate, not food policy.

July 4, 1959 *Swarajya*

KHASA

Here is a rare man, look at him from any angle, talent or character. He would have been an honour to any office in the public life of Free India and he could of course have filled any of the lightest soft jobs with dignity. But he has chosen to struggle all his life, struggling today as he began when he responded to the first call of sacrifice in the national movement, suffering today just as when he was taken to hospital after one of the most brutal episodes of the police history of those days. He and his weekly journal are one and indivisible.

Swarajya is entering on a new year with this issue. Sri Khasa has been relieved of all managerial work which is a great advantage. He can now devote all his energy to the journal.

There is before the country the great problem of how to secure welfare without surrendering the individual to be swallowed up by the State, how to get the best return for the taxes the people pay and how to preserve spiritual values while working for better material standards of life. This journal will serve all these purposes. It begins a new year of devotion with all my best wishes and prayers and those of all the good men and women of this wide country. Khasa has become a symbol for fearlessness and justice for all, and his journal is an institution of the highest national value. He expresses himself in whatever he writes with God in his heart. Hence its value.

July 11, 1959 *Swarajya*

MY KERALA CRITICS

Because I gave some hypothetical figures to explain the constitutional point for parliamentary democracy, and to deprecate violent and intimidatory demonstrations against a constitutionally installed party government, friends in Kerala have been writing to the press and to me personally that I have not grasped the situation in Kerala and that the figures I have given do not represent the relative strength of the parties in power and that of the agitation. They need not have been at pains to point this out to me. I know what divisions and dissensions divided the non-communists who were a majority and how these divisions prevented them from presenting a united front.

My knowledge of the situation and tendencies in other parts of India leads me to deprecate this kind of agitational power to be enthroned in place of the Constitution that provides for smooth and civil changes of government.

I am aware that there are defects in the machinery provided by the Constitution, as well as in the electoral practices.

But, living in a glass house, we should not encourage stone-throwing, however useful that tactic may be in the immediate context. If there are defects in the Constitution or the laws, we must calmly consider them and take steps to change them. We cannot serve peace or democracy by disregarding or by-passing them for a fleeting motive, or a transient purpose.

The root cause for the choice the electorate made was the unpopularity earned by the party that had been in office when the people were asked to vote. The causes for that unpopularity must be probed into by those who are interested in that party. May be, such an examination will be very useful not only for Kerala but outside that State also. Congressmen's reputation at the time of the last Kerala elections did not stand high, relative to the personal reputations that the Communist Party leaders enjoyed. The principal issue before simple-minded people is individual character, when the policies of the Congress take the same colour and show the same tendencies as the declared policies of the Communist Party.

Look at the laws now adumbrated in all the States at the behest of the Congress High Command and the Central Government. They do not differ much from what the Kerala Government's bills propose. There may be differences in details. But the future picture of Congress legislation and administration, as the common voter will see it, is the same as the policy and scheme of the communists.

The issue therefore gets reduced as to which group of men will act more justly and with integrity, and without unfairness between person and person. The answer to this question depends not on dogma but on the daily conduct of the men in the political parties, the fairness or the partisanship they display in their contacts and influences.

Here is the lesson that every party and India as a whole may draw from the misfortunes of Kerala. The individual party

members, and their conduct and behaviour, make or mar the party's prospects. The explanation for the Congress's defeat in the last elections in Kerala lies there, and the future history of the Congress there or elsewhere hangs round the lesson learnt therefrom.

The question is whether the present character of the bulk of the congressmen admitted into the various committees can be reformed. No one, as far as I see, who admits the disease hopes for a cure.

July 11, 1959 *Swarajya*

P.M'S. DISLIKE OF PRIVATE SECTOR

ALLERGY is only an evolutionary mechanism of 'defence'. It is no answer or argument. The Prime Minister may have his dislikes and prejudices against the leaders of the Forum of Free Enterprise. But personal allergy, apart from being interesting, cannot dispose of issues or furnish an answer to reasoned objections. If people are to be swayed or satisfied on the basis of the allergies of their leaders, it would amount to just what has come to be known by the mysterious looking but well understood phrase, 'personality cult.'

Private enterprise has its proper share in the economy of India, whether it be clearly admitted by the Congress Government or not. Indeed, it is the larger element as well as the more useful sector from the point of view of employment potential. It is as patriotic to start and manage a good private business concern, be it in industry or in transport or in distribution, as to be attached to a public managed industry either as an official or propagandist patron-saint. The individual householder, the individual workman or trader, the firms, small

and big are, if devoted honestly to their several functions, all serving society as much as, if not more than, the professional politician, and are doing patriotic work without specifically claiming the honour and the privileges of patriotism. The private sector is made up of these elements and it is no more than mere allergy to dislike them.

The Forum of Free Enterprise, I take it, is a forum for upholding the view that free enterprise is patriotic service and for meeting attacks on it by those who believe that State management is better than private management, just because it is done exclusively on behalf of the public as distinguished from private interests.

The Swatantra Party holds the view that encouraging competition in industry and giving incentives for higher production are good for the public as well as for the private interests concerned. There should be adequate safeguards against excessive prices and profits where the competition itself does not secure that end. If the Forum of Free Enterprise holds this same view, it is not understandable why it should be treated as untouchable or unapproachable. This is what I call raising allergy to the level of proof. If politics moves that way, it will certainly be lapsing into a cult of personal worship. The Swatantra Party stands for the restriction of State enterprise to undertakings related to national defence and such heavy and pioneering industries as are beyond the capacity of private enterprise to undertake or manage. It believes that nothing is gained, but much is lost, by development programmes supported by crippling taxation and abnormal deficit financing. It holds the view that taxation should be kept at levels which do not interfere with reasonable living standards for the people and not allow it to be so high and exacting, or ubiquitous, as to prevent capital formation for expansion or for individual private enterprise. If the Forum of Free Enterprise also stands for these principles, must we give them up for that reason or treat the gentlemen of the Forum as untouchable on the ground of

the P.M's allergy? It is unfair for the Prime Minister to seek to spread unreasoned prejudice against a group of people who have associated themselves for an open and honest public purpose. It is in fact a system of that class hatred which I deplore is involved in the kind of socialism that is now being preached.

If I believe that social justice and welfare are best brought about if they are done without State compulsion, with all its usual accompaniments of injustice, expropriation, repudiation of obligations and bureaucratic harassment, must I discard the assistance of those engaged in business and industry who believe likewise and wish to assist us in stemming the onset of State-control and in organizing political opposition to it? If private enterprise is to continue, private capitalism must continue, and it cannot be put down as one of the 'deadly sins'.

The story is broadcast that the Swatantra Party has plentiful finance flowing from the private sector. I wish it were true, for there is nothing more dishonourable in it than the proved and admitted flow of money from the same elements into the Congress election fund which has been expressly legalized. Official power is, alas, more effective than any identity of political purpose. I have said that I *wish* it were true, because we have still to see the truth of the public expectation of a large flow of funds from businessmen into our coffers. We have to work in a context where all the businessmen in the country are held to thraldom under the policies of taxation and control that are in operation. The agencies for intimidation and harassment which are at the disposal of the Central and the various State governments are far too ubiquitous and powerful for just causes and motives to operate without fear, when they are opposed to the ruling party.

But the Swatantra Party is a *national movement* rather than a party. If there is strength and grit in the nation to resist the totalitarianism that is in the offing, all fear and hesitancy will dissolve and disappear and we shall move on under God's care, whoever is there or not there. It is really a movement of eman-

cipation and the youth of the country are more interested in it than the older men. Some of us are in the forefront not because we represent any particular interest or a trade union of seniors but because our experience guides us in this direction. Youth and intelligence have been boycotted or misled by the totalitarians. We detest the slogans of class and caste hatred that come too easily to hand in political rivalries. We wish to release youth from the spell cast over them and from the political indifference to which they have been relegated.

July 18, 1959 *Swarajya*

THE CASE AGAINST B. C. G.

The British Medical Journal (dated June 6, 1959) gives the place of honour to an article entitled "The Case Against B.C.G." contributed by the following seventeen eminent doctors holding distinguished and responsible positions in renowned medical institutions : Arnold S. Anderson, M.D. ; L. B. Dickey, M.D. ; Max L. Durfee, M.D. ; S. M. Farber, M.D. ; L. S. Jordan, M.D. ; Kathleen B. Jordan, M.D. ; Edward Kupka, M.D. ; H. D. Lees, M.D. ; E. R. Lavine, M.D. ; C. A. McKinlay,M.D. ; Max S. Marshall, Ph.D. ; E. A. Meyerding, M.D. ; J. A. Myers, M.D. ; George G. Ornstein, M.D. ; S. A. Slater, M.D. ; A. V. Stoesser, M.D. ; and H. C. Sweany, M.D.

After a lengthy and learned discussion of the subject, the authors conclude with a summary which is given below.

I give it to readers of *Swarajya* more to tell them that my attitude on this question is not that of a prejudiced and ill-informed layman, but a view supported by very eminent physicians and bacteriologists. I do not hope the Government of India will give up its ill-informed and obstinate programme of

wasting public money on this futile 'immunization' so called. But it is good, all the same, that the public is informed of the best opinion on the subject, the worthlessness of this quackery, and the uselessness of mere figures which prove nothing.

Tuberculosis differs from small-pox in that an attack does not result in dependable immunity. Thus there is slim premise for attempting to produce immunity artificially. Allergy to tuberculo-protein is not an indication of immunity, but is pre-requisite to the development of clinical tuberculosis. The human body defends itself better against first invasions with tubercle bacilli than it does against reinfections. Clinical disease develops only in persons who have been previously sensitized to tuberculo-protein.

Accurate differentiation between primary pulmonary infiltrates and reinfection type of clinical lesions is of the utmost importance. Without this, erroneous deductions are made with reference to efficacy of B.C.G. For example, it may be credited with beneficial effects when primary infiltrates are grouped with reinfection type of lesions, so it appears that more control subjects develop clinical disease than those who have primary lesions produced in the skin by B.C.G.

An adequately controlled study of B.C.G. among people living in their homes has never been accomplished. It has been found impossible. However, well-controlled studies were conducted among cattle in North America and elsewhere. B.C.G. failed and was abandoned. In the few places where it is still used with major dependence upon it, tuberculosis remains a serious problem among cattle.

Among people, the most phenomenal accomplishments in tuberculosis eradication have been achieved where little or no B.C.G. has been used, including Iceland, Hawaii, and the Netherlands. In countries which have employed B.C.G. extensively, including Denmark, Norway, and Sweden, marvellous results have been achieved, but along with B.C.G. they have employed the same fundamental methods which alone brought about the most phenomenal accomplishments in history. This also applies to special groups such as students of nursing and medicine.

The numerous values of the tuberculin test in diagnosis, epidemiology, etc., are lost to persons whose tissues have been sensitized to tuberculo-protein by B.C.G.

Bacteriological investigations have revealed that cultures designated B.C.G. were not composed of just one, but of multiple bacterial forms, some of which were definitely invasive for animal tissues. No two cultures were alike Evidently different mutants and changes had occurred in each of the cultures studied. Apparently mutants produced destructive disease in animals on deficient diet, those which were silicotic, and at least two species of normal animals. In people, they sometimes caused lesions at the site of administration and of regional lymph nodes as well as other organs, and death in at least a few cases. Calmette repeatedly warned that no living organism capable of producing tubercle in animal tissues should be administered to people.

If methods of preventing mutation in cultures have been or can be devised, there is no assurance that it will not occur after the living organisms are introduced into human tissues.

July 18, 1959 *Swarajya*

CALL TO UNINVOLVED NATIONS

CONSIDERABLE scientific knowledge is at work (or is it play?) now in the Geneva Conference. Both sides have declared they both wish that nuclear tests should cease. But national scientists on either side are busy delaying the accomplishment of that wish. Science is exploring the various possibilities of evasion, and detection of evasion, and thereby impeding agreement.

It makes one laugh although it is a very sad affair. Is it not clear to the meanest understanding that neither of the two warring parties will ever explode tests when once the agreement not to explode any tests is solemnly signed? Neither America nor Russia will do so shameful a thing and take the

chance of being condemned by the enlightened world. The participants appear to believe in science but not in commonsense or human nature.

Again, when it is expressly agreed that either party to the treaty can at any time denounce it when it is able to say to the world that the other party is doing something in violation of the treaty, why is it necessary to waste any more time on what is not going to happen, unless indeed it is the object to find some excuse not to enter into any agreement at all ?

The governments of the uninvolved nations are truly as much concerned in this ban of nuclear tests as either America or Russia. The damage is world-wide and not only to the nations exploding tests. The uninvolved nations ought really to hold the initiative. Instead, they have let it go to the two nations that are poisoning the world to decide whether they may stop their criminal activities or not !

The nuclear Powers may accept ill-health and disease as the price to pay for making and possessing weapons of what they consider to be of defensive value to themselves. But why should the rest of the world suffer the poisoning because America and Russia do not trust each other ? There is not the faintest reason for the uninvolved nations to accept the damage that is done by the nuclear tests. There is not even the foolish idea that it makes it safer against our enemy, to justify this poisoning for the sake of national defence. The Americans may be wrongly but patriotically induced to accept all the evils that science forewarns them. But why should India, Japan and the millions of the uninvolved nations of the world accept the poisoning ? It is not God's infliction, but the infliction of the nuclear Powers who have no right to poison us. The uninvolved are more concerned than the participants in the Geneva Conference, yet there is no activity among the former except tamely watching whether the poisoners are near to some agreement among themselves.

July 25, 1959 *Swarajya*

THE NEW PARTY

The Swatantra Party stands for the protection of the individual citizen against the increasing trespasses of the State. It is an answer to the challenge of the so-called socialism of the Congress Party. It is founded on the conviction that social justice and welfare can be attained through the fostering of individual interest and individual enterprise in all fields better than through State ownership and government control. It is based on the truth that bureaucratic management leads to loss of incentive and waste of resources. When the State trespasses beyond what is legitimately within its province, it just hands over the management from those who are interested in frugal and efficient management to the bureaucracy which is untrained and uninterested except in its own survival.

The Swatantra Party is founded on the claim that individual citizens should be free to hold their property and carry on their professions freely and through binding mutual agreements among themselves, and that the State should assist and encourage in every possible way the individual in this freedom, but not seek to replace him.

The new party seeks to oppose the trend of the ruling Congress Party to adopt the ways and ideals of the communists in its eagerness to prevent the communists from going forward. The Swatantra Party believes that going over to the enemy is not defence, but surrender.

The Swatantra Party, apart from the ideology here explained, hopes to furnish a real Opposition to the Congress Party so that parliamentary democracy may be properly balanced. The absence of a true Opposition has led to the rapid deterioration of democracy into a kind of totalitarianism. Voices

have been heard from all quarters calling for a strong Opposition and the new party is supplying a felt want. This party of freedom is further making a novel experiment in restricting disciplinary control over party members to essential issues, giving freedom in all other matters to vote according to individual opinion. This is not mere strategy to 'net in' discordant, miscellaneous elements as at first might appear. It is really an answer to the constantly expressed sense of dissatisfaction with party rigidity, and to the complaint that it often amounts to suppression of opinion and rule by a minority in the name of a majority. A majority in the ruling caucus can always, under present conditions, impose its views on all and every issue in the Parliament of the nation. The Swatantra Party intends to initiate a departure from the usual practice of political parties and, true to its name, give *swatantra* or freedom to its members to vote according to their own convictions (and conscience) on all but the party's fundamentals so that the decisions of Parliament may, on those issues, truly reflect the prevailing opinion, and not be just a replica of the majority opinion of the ruling party or the fads of the ruling clique.

Without the inconveniences resulting from proportional representation and, in particular, the instability of governments formed under such a system, the reduction of voting in accordance with whips to the barest minimum, as proposed by the Swatantra Party would be a healthy example for all parties. If followed generally, or even by the more important ones among the various parties, the freedom given to members on all but essential issues would result in government more in accordance with the ideals of those who conceived the system of proportional representation and laid high hopes thereon. In this matter the new party may claim to have initiated a great democratic advance worthy of trial in all countries really believing in democracy, and not willing to be subjected to a form of dictatorship in the name of party discipline, which often serves only the ambition of individuals or groups.

The new party does not believe that legislative compulsion any more than the violence that preceded and enthroned communism in certain countries can contribute to true or lasting human happiness. We must depend on the moral sense of the people in order to equalize without destroying freedom.

It may be that there are a large number of people in our ancient land who have now lost the capacity to respond to moral appeals, who are impervious to the call of *dharma.* There have been causes that have brought about this state of things. But this large number of bad and successful men of the world should not blind us to the fact that, in the large mass, *dharma* still rules and supports our society. The millions that make up our nation are still moved and guided by their sense of *dharma* and the voice of their conscience. If the cynics who deny this were right, our society would have broken down long ago and perished. We should have been hearing of starvation deaths in thousands every day. If we take a survey of the numerous charitable foundations and trusts that work as a matter of routine in the country, and which were born out of a sense of *dharma,* without any kind of State compulsion, we can cure our cynicism with irrefutable and abundant facts. The charitable motives and compulsions of the heart which prevailed in the days when trusts and charitable institutions were founded can prevail today, for we are the same people after all.

"There is no need for charity when there is an obligation; let the State compel." This is the slogan of the socialists. But it is forgotten that this will lead irresistibly to total serfdom.

The cynics are not right. Our society is still maintained by the inner law. The outer laws can touch but the fringe of life. They deal with criminals and keep order going. Normal life does not depend on the laws. It depends on the moral consciousness of people. This moral sense has not been effaced whatever changes may have taken place in the rituals and observances of forms. It is by *dharma* that society (*Lokah*) *dhriyate.*

It is on *dharma* we must build, and not on the sands of material motives and our capacity to satisfy them quickly and get votes to be in power. The good seed is not lost. It is still there. We must not ignore its availability. The soil also is good and God will send us the rains. Let us not fail to look after it.

July 25, 1959 *Swarajya*

DAILY PRESS — A TRUE INDEX

THE total circulation of the daily newspapers of India in 1957 was 13½ lakhs. Of this, English dailies were read by 10 lakhs. Readers of Hindi papers came next, but far behind, being less than four lakhs of readers, much less than half the number that read the English dailies. Next to Hindi came the readers of Tamil dailies serving nearly three lakhs. The other languages came behind this, each with between one and two-and-half lakhs of readers.

If the circulation of the daily press is a realistic index of what is the efficient 'inter-lingua' of India, English holds that position beyond doubt. Any other view is wishful thinking unrelated to actual facts. The daily press barometer ought to moderate the impudence of the Hindi agitators. If the explanation of widespread illiteracy in Upper India is given for this low place taken by Hindi papers, the answer is that the language issue concerns only the literates, not those who cannot read any language.

Some good people wonder why I busy myself so greatly to keep this language issue going. In the simplicity of their hearts many believe that, if I kept quiet, Chacha Nehru, who is a just man, would see to it that injustice is not practised. It is a pity

that these people do not have the imagination to see what is likely to happen if we do not fight hard putting forth all our energy. The Hindi people do not know our difficulties. They think Hindi will give them great advantages and self-interest blinds them to the rights of others. Officials are loyal and there is so little courage available these days to enable them to stand up to their political masters. They see the injustice clearly enough but they think it prudent to conspire with the Hindi faction.

We have had many assurances of 'no imposition' and the like, but the practice is contrary to assurances as has been proved by complaints from those affected.

Linguism has split the country and has led to a tendency to erect solid walls isolating States from one another. Every State government is determined to intimidate and overrule university opinion and insist on universities being run each in its own regional language. As a result of the intimate connection between higher education and the permanent services, the mobility of officials as well as of students seeking higher education will soon totally disappear.

The only way to meet this impending disaster is to get the colleges and the offices everywhere to accept English and continue the *status quo.* All change is not reform. To make this country into an archipelago of linguistic islands, educationally and administratively, is not a desirable thing. Linguism threatens to become a galloping disease which must be tackled by maintaining intact the vital circulating system of the body politic of India. The part that the English press actually plays today, in spite of all the talk about Hindi, is a highly relevant fact. Invaluable as the local service of language papers may be, the all India inter-State service of the English papers is incomparably great. Hindi cannot claim anything like what the English papers are doing. None but those who refuse to see can be blind to the inevitable inference from this incontestable fact as to what the all India official medium ought to be.

A loyal member of the Indian diplomatic corps has written an article beginning with the following remark: "It would have pleased Macaulay's heart to hear what these elder statesmen are saying about English."

And what if it pleased Macaulay? How would it be wrong if it pleased him and what would it prove? Nothing. It is sad to see this puerile hatred still masquerading as patriotism. Who was Macaulay? Read Thackeray's *Round About Papers* and you will see what a good and noble person he was. Macaulay was not the anti-Indian of the crude imagination of ill-informed patriots. He was one who foresaw with satisfaction today's freedom of India.

Our own languages, and particularly Sanskrit, offer the best literature for cultural and spiritual requirements. But, for balance and for the vast and growing volume of modern knowledge, we must have the window of English kept wide open.

The importance of English in international life is unquestioned. We would be foolish if we threw away our asset in that field. It has struck root in administration, in law and in education. We cannot ignore the issues of justice and inconvenience, and all that issues from the fact of two hundred years of history and throw out English, just because it is a foreign language. Hindi is not far from foreign to those to whom it is not a mother-tongue, and these are not a negligible number.

De Tocqueville, in his great book on democracy in America, foresaw the possibility of a State which without practising any bloody oppression would reduce people to "nothing better than a flock of timid and industrious animals of which the government is the shepherd that would undertake to spare its subjects all the cares of thinking and all the trouble of living". It seems we are in danger of illustrating this possiblity.

August 1959 *Broadway Times*

SILKEN THREAD OF THE *GITA*

THE *Bhagavad Gita* is a two-stranded thread like the silk of the silkworm. Sericulturists know that the silkworm issues its thread in two strands, and when this is twisted, the thread gets the spring and the elasticity and the glamour that distinguishes silk and makes it so attractive to man. The two strands of the *Gita* thread are (1) the teaching of the *Gita-Acharya* (the teacher), and (2) the message of an incarnation of the all-merciful God. These two strands are twisted into one unbroken thread from chapter one to chapter eighteen, giving it the elasticity and the strength of natural silk. It is this silk we should weave into our lives.

For the sake of analysis, let us pull the strands apart and examine them closely, though still with reverence. The teaching part is a protestant movement. The object is to wean people away from a traditional goal that had, on the whole, proved futile, to a new and rich way of life—from *sanyasa* to activity without attachment.

No sensible reformer would deal savagely with what he seeks to do away with, but would try to keep the psychology of reverence intact while pushing forward the new way, almost as if it were just a modification of the old doctrine, explaining the similarity rather than exaggerating or even emphasizing the difference.

Understand the essence of things, says the *Gita-Acharya*, do not be lost in the formalities of ritual. What good is a pool when the whole country is flooded with water all over? If you have attained true knowledge which is a flood, you may discard the *Veda* which is but a pool—mind you, only if you have attained true knowledge.

The traditional goal was *sanyasa.* Its glamour is so great that even now, after the *Gita-Acharya's* attack on it and after the attacks of centuries of materialism and scepticism and exotic faiths with temporal power behind them, *sanyasa* still attracts.

The *Gita-Acharya* aimed at turning men away from *sanyasa* to the due performance of duty. The bridge-head he constructed for this turning from one road to another was the giving up of our attachments to the fruits of action.

Is it your duty? Then do it. Do not think of what you will gain by it. It is enough for you to know that it is what you should do. It may produce many things, good, bad and indifferent; but it is not your concern.

What is the essence of *sanyasa* which you have been told is the holy path? Its virtue consists in the internal renunciation of desires that it involves, not in the absence of worldly activities which is the external result. In my teaching that you should perform your duties, says the *Gita-Acharya,* there is involved renunciation, too, for I ask you to give up the thought of all gain from what you do. The essence that makes *sanyasa* what it is, viz., renunciation, you have in my teaching that you should perform all your duties and perform them always without regard to what you will get out of them, without concern or anxiety as to whether you will succeed or fail. Are you a soldier? Must you go to the battlefield? Is it your duty? Do it; do it without concern as to defeat or victory, and without seeking to gain anything beyond the satisfaction of having honourably discharged your duty. So, too, in every other case or walk of life, civil military, social, communal or domestic.

The *Gita-Acharya's* teaching as to the performance of duty without desire or attachment to the fruits of such action has come to be called *Karma Yoga.* He himself would call it simply *yoga,* without any qualifying adjective. It is a way of life that should

apply to all activity, secular or religious. He taught this and this alone. He did not present alternative *yogas*.

This debunking of *sanyasa* is done by the *Gita-Acharya* so delicately and with so much reverence for tradition, that it has been possible for upholders of *sanyasa* even now to so interpret the *Gita* as to keep the traditional doctrine of *sanyasa* still alive and as consistent with Sri Krishna's teaching. The *Gita-Acharya* says that the performance of duty without attachment to the fruits thereof is as good as *sanyasa*. So, the commentator argues, the standard for passing it as good enough is still *sanyasa*. And therefore *sanyasa* is still the true and best way. *Karma Yoga* may be merely as good as *sanyasa*. For the sake of emphasizing the efficacy of detachment the *Gita-Acharya* may say that detachment makes the performance of duty as good as *sanyasa*. But that is only a style of expression, a figure of speech. *Sanyasa* still stands untouched as the supreme and real way of life to reach salvation—like the standard pound or yard kept by the government in its custody for testing the correctness of weights and measures in use.

In spite of what such commentators have said, it is clear that the *Gita-Acharya's* theme and teaching throughout the book is the performance of work as duty without the contamination of desire or attachment to the fruits of such action.

The *Gita-Acharya's* aim was to reconcile the highest in the Hindu way of life with active participation in worldly affairs which society demanded. This was his reaction to the evils to which *sanyasa* had led in the net result. He intended to bring about a change-over from *sanyasa* to daily life with detachment qualifying and purifying all activities. But unlike the angry and impetuous social reformer, he did not pull the house down or create confusion by doctrinal innovation. He explained and emphasized that what the *Gita* says is nothing new but the very oldest doctrine. The *Gita-Acharya* wanted that religion should be joined up to life in an integrated bond. He did not want

that religion should be wedded to inaction and equated with laziness and dependence on others.

The other strand of the silken thread of the *Bhagavad Gita* is devotion and worship of the Supreme Being as a person. The glamour of monistic contemplation on the basis of the Absolute One without qualification had been overworked, resulting in intolerable barrenness. The personal Deity had to be revived. So God comes in an incarnation as Vasudeva and personally claims worship in the *Gita.* Except in only one place throughout the *Gita,* Krishna does not speak of *Isvara* in the third person. It is always I, Me and My.

> Think of Me always, devote yourself to Me, offer your worship to Me, bow in reverence to Me, and you shall in the end reach Me. This is certain, I swear it here unto you who are My beloved.

No one does anything except when urged to it as *leela* of *Isvara.* Soak your mind in charity. All men's activities are His. Therefore judge no one. Surrender yourself to Him who rules all. His grace will lead you to eternal joy. This is the message of Vasudeva.

The *Gita-Acharya* having taken us away from the goal of renunciation and abnegation to the systematic performance of duties, although with an important qualification and condition, Vasudeva the All-Merciful recognizes that we must stumble in our path in a hundred ways and for a hundred causes. We must go through error and sin. The need for grace is therefore imperative. And so Vasudeva, the *avatar* of All-Merciful God, says :

> Come unto Me. You may have gone many times astray. Surrender yourself completely to My care. I shall release you from all your sins. Do not grieve.

This promise of grace and the acceptance of it in utter faith is an essential part of the life of activity that has to take the

place of *sanyasa* according to the *Gita*. It is wound up with detachment and performance of duty in one silken thread.

This then is the *Bhagavad Gita*. The teacher and the Incarnation of God together speak it to us. It is a scripture eminently suited for imperfect men who desire to be guided by holy light.

Human nature is the same everywhere, and in all lands teachers and prophets have necessarily come to the same conclusion as to how men should live. Their teachings and messages are much the same as what we have in the *Gita*. It is not my purpose to plead that the *Gita* is better or fuller than other scriptures. I have only attempted to explain it to those to whom it has been given as a holy book and who deem it as their peculiar possession, who have less of scholarship than even myself and who like me stand greatly in need of grace.

August 1959 *Dipika*

DISTURBING PEASANT OWNERSHIP

As the revered President of the Indian Union realized the emergency and wrote to the Prime Minister, it is wrong to mix up the aim of increased food production with the popular desire to level down wealth. The proposals to deplete the possessions of the larger landholders and to put pressure and offer temptations through special facilities and subsidies, in order to substitute multiple ownership and multiple management to take the place of individual ownership and individual attention, are clearly detrimental to production, whatever satisfaction it may give in other respects to those who, in disregard of the Upanishad teaching, *maa grdhah kasyasviddhanam,* have learnt to dislike the sight of other people's prosperity.

Co-operative society management means giving up one's own land in exchange for a title on paper and giving up the management of it to an official responsible (on paper) to the composite body of owners, but who in practice will be responsible only to his official superiors.

The Prime Minister frankly admitted in a recent speech in Nepal that socialism today would lead, not to prosperity or distribution of wealth, but only to distribution of poverty and operate as an impediment in the growth of national wealth.

Congress bosses of the second and third degree go about saying that the landless will get lands. This is a *cent per cent lie,* not a half-truth. The lands robbed will be put under government-chosen 'co-operative' officers. There are not lands enough for distribution among the landless, and it will not be done. Perhaps a few favourites may benefit, generating jealousy all round.

The talk of all sorts of changes in respect of property and other things, which hitherto had been thought to be protected by law, has resulted in widespread uncertainty, and complete lack of incentive. Unless individuals have incentive to work there can be no national wealth produced. The policy of official management means a vast increase of new administrative jobs, primary and supervisory, and waste of public money, and in the net result, inefficiency. It is proved by experience that, where work that is best done by individual proprietors is taken over for official management, national resources are largely wasted.

Government has to be by political parties. In spite of every effort, the administration of government is more and more done in accordance with the partisan wishes of ministers and party bosses. The land that is proposed to be taken away above a fixed ceiling is not enough for satisfying the poverty of even a few favoured clients. And why should government be clothed with the garb of benefactor when it distributes other people's properties?

What has the talk of socialism done besides giving a deceptive slogan for misleading poverty-confused people?

It is said that there has been a very good crop this year. This is surely not the effect of the socialistic or co-operative pattern but was produced by the old pattern of individual ownership.

Why did we discourage and destroy the joint family system? We said individual incentive was better than clubbing people together and leaving them all generally irresponsible. This argument should apply much more strongly to the clubbing together of people who are not members of one family but are strangers to one another and very jealous of one another.

The high taxation measures adopted to finance the Plans have dried up sources of private charity and have tended to make government the only charitable institution in the country. The Plans hitherto followed have caused intolerable inflation. To the distress caused by high prices, we are told, will be added fresh direct and indirect taxation, and concealed taxation of consumers through State trading to the tune of many thousand crores more.

Hatred between classes on the basis of rich and poor is now officially spread on a large scale as a result of the vague talk about undefined and unplanned socialism.

Increased incentive to individual effort and individual generosity is now what is called for. The great plans of Government will admittedly take decades for their benefits to reach the doors of the poor. A moral drive for private charitable movements will serve to help poor people even as and when individual effort goes into production. Promotion of hatred is as immoral as inexpedient.

The principles of the Swatantra Party have been published. They embody the philosophy of individual freedom. *Swatantra*

is the positive content of what the English word freedom denotes. *Paratantra* is the citizen's status as it follows from the present Congress policies, a status of increasing serfdom. The sapping of individual responsibility can only lead to *paratantra.* The secret of spiritual and material progress is in the development of *swatantra.* Progress at the cost of *swatantra* will prove to be a Dead Sea fruit as it has proved in communist countries.

August 1, 1959 *Swarajya*

THOUGHTS ON INDEPENDENCE DAY*

It is the greatest paradox of the age that two nations are admittedly good and of kindly temperament and each knows this of the other and solemnly affirms it, and yet the governments that rule the two nations are determined to be enemies of each other.

Mr. Henry Cabot Lodge, the eminent American statesman, said in the United Nations Security Council on July 26 :

> It is a sad thing that a people as warm-hearted as the Russian people—and I know from experience that they are warm-hearted—should be represented by a Government that is as cold-hearted, as brutal and as hard as it has shown itself to be.

Mr. Vasily Kuznetsov, Soviet Deputy Foreign Minister, said on the same day and at the same place :

> The American people have friendly feelings towards the Soviet people, but the governing circles of the U.S. conduct a hostile policy towards the Soviet Union.

* This article appeared in the Independence Day supplements of many dailies in India on August 15, 1959.

There is no questioning the sincerity of the statements. There must be something wrong in the present ordering of things which makes this contradiction between people and government possible.

Democracy must be admitted to have failed in a vital matter if there is a gap in foreign policy of war and peace between the will of the people as admitted by friends as well as enemies and the policy and determination of the governments established by the consent or assent of the peoples concerned. It is not a transitory feature, but a continuing and persistent phenomenon and it is the substance of the cold war.

Here is matter for sincere, fundamental and courageous thinking. It cannot be that nations deliberately put people in charge of their affairs who think and feel and do the opposite of what they themselves as a people think and feel in such a serious matter.

There must be something radically wrong in the mechanism of governance; for, otherwise, there should not be room for this disastrous and persistent contradiction. Is it that responsibility itself makes people worse instead of making them better, that it makes people less of human beings than they were as ordinary citizens, without the responsibility of government? And if this be the case, what shall we do about it? Is it not an unimportant detail, but one fraught with grave and evil consequence.

It is intolerable that two masses of men and women should have the highest respect and regard, and feelings of kindliness and brotherhood for one another, but that they should be prevented from acting according to their nature by the governments that they respectively appoint for themselves, and yet both peoples should feel wholly impotent about it.

The governments themselves find it not possible to shape their action to bring it into accord with national sentiment. And

finally both government and people submit to this paradox as inevitable. There would be no contradiction if the sincerity on either side were doubtful, but it is admittedly not doubted and is reaffirmed again and again.

The consequence is that a deliberate effort is made to bring things into conformity by spreading and rousing hatred where there was none, to bring people to think even as the government does and remove the paradox, making the cure worse than the disease.

What has been said about America and Russia would apply with some necessary modifications to Pakistan and India, although explicit admissions have not been made in this case as have been done by Mr. Lodge and Mr. Kuznetsov. The admissions are there in the national consciousness of each people and no one doubts this fact.

This gap between people and government seems to be the creation of the mechanism rather than that of intelligent human minds. The sooner we set this right, the better for all of us.

This is a thought I tender for our Independence Day. It is not enough we call our condition by good names. It should really be a good condition, conducive to happiness and free from anxiety and fear.

August 15, 1959 —*The India News and Feature Alliance*

THE CASE FOR THE SWATANTRA PARTY

When a monarch rules and his rule is absolute there is no room for discussion. When a particular class rules absolutely —be it an aristocracy or be it trade unions—there may be discussion among the members of that class, but outside that

boundary there is no debate. In democracy, where Demos holds all authority and power, debate is essential. For Demos is not a person but an aggregate of thinking persons, no single individual in which exercises authority or power. The aggregate is not itself a thinking machine. Each individual thinks and the totality of it is calculated and power vested in it. Demos as a total cannot think. We cannot obtain an independent conclusion or opinion from it. We must have a calculating machine to discover and give effect to its decisions.

In order to make this machine work, we must put before it the pros and cons and obtain a simple 'yes' or 'no'. We must put before it the thesis and the antithesis and ask for a simple choice between the one and the other. If there is no satisfactory arrangment for such presentation of the thesis and the antithesis, we do not get Demos's answer, but are likely to be misled and that leads to a crisis or a 'failure' of democracy.

The need for an 'Opposition' party in democracy arises out of this basic quality and fundamental limitation of Demos. A single party cannot run a democracy. It automatically becomes a 'tyranny'. We cannot get a choice between the thesis and the antithesis out of a single disciplined party. It would be like an ill-balanced pair of panniers working awkwardly on tentatively obtained counterbalances.

Everyone therefore grants that our Government is not as well as it should be, because there is no real Opposition party. It is admitted that the parties now sitting in opposition to the Congress are groups that egg on towards the same side and do not act as an Opposition. That is why the Prime Minister has welcomed the formation of the Swatantra Party. It is agreed that there is always the danger of a party in power going wrong and that it should be, therefore, under the continued fire of an Opposition so that errors may be minimized. The Prime Minister for this reason welcomes a strong Opposition just as any wise controller of automobile licences would insist on sound brakes in every car, whether they have to go into action or not.

The Swatantra Party stands for minimum government and minimum State interference, for minimum expenditure in administration and for minimum taxation, for minimum interference in the private and professional affairs of citizens, and for minimum regulation in industry and trade. As against this are the declared policies, intentions and tendencies of the Congress Party in favour of what has been called 'socialism' which is State control of everything. The thesis of the Congress Party is that welfare and social justice can be secured only by increasing State control, as against the antithesis that prosperity, welfare and justice can be more effectively achieved by minimizing State interference and enlarging individual incentive and fair competition. The Swatantra Party stands for the latter proposition and all that follows from it under modern conditions.

The Swatantra Party does not deny the need for regulation, but holds that regulation must be limited to requirement and not expanded to the point of killing individual incentive. Aggregate wealth and production depend on individual incentive and production. State management and State investment involve maximum waste and maximum expenditure as against the frugal conditions accompanying all individual enterprise and decentralized effort. Responsibility is reduced if the individual disappears and multiple ownership and delegated authority take over the management.

The Congress Party has so far run without a true Opposition. It has run with accelerators and no brakes. It has put into effect policies and plans that have increased administrative expenditure and caused inflation. Prices have gone up all round and taxation has reached the breaking-point. The waste associated with State management is brought to light on every occasion when a window is opened. Widespread dissatisfaction over these things is undeniable and there is no need to give details.

The basic need for prosperity is adequate food production. It is admitted on all hands that attempts at egalitarian distri-

bution of wealth would be utterly foolish before the deficit in food production is set right and much more production all round is assured. Egalitarian distribution of distress and poverty is not what anybody wants.

The Congress Party has unfortunately resolved to tinker with the basic machinery of food production, on the assumption that the fault lies there. It has resolved, on the one hand, on fragmentation and, on the other, on destroying individual incentive and handing over farm production to multiple ownership without individual incentive. This is the meaning and the effect of the proposals for putting a ceiling on the extent of individual ownership of land, and placing the expropriated excess under what is called co-operative management, which in effect means delegated authority to paid officials. Any attempt at altering basic machinery must be justified by thorough knowledge and experience. This is sadly wanting in those who seek to disturb the basic economy of Indian life, namely, individual ownership of land and personal incentive for production thereon.

The consequences of this tinkering have not been fully realized. Those who are engaged in the business of cultivation realize the likely consequences and they are opposing the policy. Government-inspired and Government-subsidized propaganda feebly tries to raise a smoke-screen over popular opposition, talking the vague language of co-operation being better than isolation. When the Government aims at achieving a pattern, we may expect it to develop pressures and discriminatory policies which are as bad as direct compulsion.

The Swatantra Party has been born out of this conflict between reality on the one hand and inexperienced ambition, on the other. The Swatantra Party stands for non-interference with the ownership of land, and against any policy that extinguishes individual incentive in that field and seeks to substitute official management for owner-management.

This attitude has nothing to do with what is usually mixed up with it, namely, the duty of the Government to do all in its power to preserve harmony and restore co-operation among all those elements that must unite to produce agricultural prosperity. The abolition of the zemindari system has nothing to do with it. The zemindar was a mere tax-gatherer appointed by the old governments; and to him a number of advantages were given by the governments that relieved themselves of the unpleasant and difficult work of collecting what was called 'rent', but which really was tax. The zemindar was given the false cloak of ownership to enable him to collect tax more tyrannically. The real legal owners were on the land.

The present proposals of the Government are to deal not with such zemindars or their rights, but with the rights of real proprietors of land who own their lands as a gentleman owns his car or his bank account. This difference is not easily realized by landless politicians or voters in the regions, where until very recently the zemindari system prevailed so entirely that people have no idea of the ryotwari system. The ryot was, and is, the owner and he has been guaranteed the full enjoyment of his rights by the Constitution. It is this that is sought now to be interfered with.

The Swatantra Party aims at remedying the past errors of the Congress Government, as far as possible, and preventing further errors in the same direction. A car which had for long no proper brakes and which ran over many people is sought to be now supplied with good brakes. It is not perhaps possible for the new brakes to restore the casualties already caused, but much can be done by way of prevention of further mischief. The analogy of brakes does not fully reveal the potentiality of an Opposition party, for an Opposition party also offers to take over government when that is necessary, and the ruling party would then become the Opposition.

Apart from all this, if we examine the affairs of the political party which the Indian National Congress has converted itself

into, there has been a great deterioration in what matters most, namely, the moral quality of the elements composing the party. Careerism has taken the place of character, and material desires that of patriotism. The public reputation and presumption of high-mindedness which every congressman as such enjoyed when we fought the foreign regime are no longer there. A general feeling of aversion has taken the place of the universal respect and affection which were once the privilege of the congressman. This along with the prevailing feeling of uncertainty in all matters where the ruling party exercises authority—and that is a wide field—makes the organization of a new party necessary to restore confidence and interest in public life.

It is not possible to improve the Congress from inside. People have tried it. But vested interests prevent this, and here the phrase has its real derogatory meaning. All the men who control the decisions of the Congress as to its composition or organization are against any changes that will alter its present deteriorated character, for they are interested in its continuing as an instrument for their own individual advantage. An external attack may, however, change the situation. Reform may set in as a defence.

The Swatantra Party believes that social justice and welfare can be reached more certainly and properly in other ways than through the techniques of so-called 'socialism' with all its accompaniments of injustice, expropriation and repudiation of obligations. It believes that every effort should be made to preserve what is good in our culture and to replace by spiritual values the materialistic philosophy of life that has resulted from the efforts merely to raise what is called the standard of life. It is not good for the nation to allow the State which, be it remembered, must always be in the grip of some political party with its own motives and interests, to run all the beneficent activities of the nation as its exclusive monopoly, at the same time taxing the people for all the wasteful cost of that monopolized charity.

The party believes that all the educational activities of the Government, direct and indirect, should be such as to emphasize the moral obligation of those who possess wealth to hold it in trust for society, and a doctrine of life based on that moral obligation as distinguished from seeking to establish a socialistic structure based on legislative sanctions, involving expropriation and loss of incentive for the individual to work, and increasing dependence on the State and its officials in every walk of life. The party is opposed to all those policies and forecasts of future governmental action which have created an all-pervading and deep sense of uncertainty drying up all interest in land and factory alike.

The party recognizes the paramount need for increasing food production and believes that it is best attained through the continuance of the self-employed peasant-proprietor who stands for initiative and freedom and is interested in obtaining the highest yields from the land. The party believes in an intensive programme of agricultural improvement, without disturbing the harmony of rural life amongst the elements that compose it, and by promoting the material and psychological inducement for modern production. The party seeks to introduce a more intensive programme than is now being followed in respect of the supply of material, implements and credit to the farmer without any discrimination among individuals and without in any way interfering with the cultivator's rights of ownership, management and cultivation of the land. The party is opposed to cultivation through organizations which are a loose kind of multiple ownership, certain to sap the incentive of the farmer, reduce farm output and end in a collective economy and bureaucratic management.

•

The party stands for raising the level of life of the farmer by taking steps to maintain a reasonable and fair price for his produce. In industry, the party stands for the increase of incentives for higher production and expansion which are promoted by competitive enterprise, with adequate safeguards

against excessive and unreasonable prices, profits and dividends where the competition itself does not secure these ends. The party would restrict State enterprise to heavy industries to supplement private enterprise in that field, national services such as the railways and the starting of pioneer industries where private initiative is lacking. The party wants taxation to be kept at such a level that it does not interfere with reasonable living standards for the people, both rural and urban, and which, while being necessary and sufficient for carrying on administration and such social services as must be undertaken, is yet not so high and exacting or so ubiquitous as to prevent capital formation and investment by individuals; it is opposed to hasty and lopsided development based on heavy taxation, deficit financing and foreign loans out of all proportion to economic repayment-capacity, leading to excessive inflation.

The party firmly holds that the guarantees specified in the original Constitution in respect of freedom of property, trade, employment and just compensation for any property acquired for public purposes should be restored. The party is against the excessive expansion of bureaucratic services with a hierarchy of officials made to do work which is best done privately and independently. The party believes that the State will best serve its citizens by giving facilities for a proper decentralized distribution of industry, limiting its regulatory function to the prevention and punishment of unsocial activities wherever called for.

The philosophy of the Swatantra Party has thus been set out in concrete shape. It stands for the individual to retain his identity and his motives for honest endeavour, and for his serving the community with a willing heart and not out of compulsion. The *dharma* of our land and not State management should be the foundation of all our efforts towards prosperity, social justice, welfare and happiness. Those who are materially prosperous should consider themselves bound to help the less fortunate. People should cease deceiving one another and begin honestly to help those who come to them. If we have no faith

in our people, if we do not trust one another, democracy will be a poor make-believe and will break down with anarchy into rule by force. Social co-operation has always been our *dharma.* The State should recede into comparative insignificance and *dharma* should be restored to its original position as sovereign over men, women and government.

August 16, 1959 *The Illustrated Weekly of India*

WHO ARE THE FASCISTS?

"CONSERVATISM is the surest shield of liberty in the specific conditions of the twentieth century," so affirms Mr. W. H. Chamberlain in his latest book. "It is because of increasing disillusionment in the feasibility of Utopian short-cuts to freedom and prosperity, as a result of personal experience and study of history" that (he says) he has reached this conviction. Mr. Chamberlain was for twelve years in Moscow. "I went to Moscow," he says, "with no prospect of material advancement, but rather in the spirit of the Muslim making his pilgrimage to Mecca." Such a modern thinking appreciation of conservatism is worth pondering over.

The refusal to face the facts of life is not the characteristic, says Mr. Chamberlain, of the true conservative who is not just a nostalgic visionary. The disingenuous tendency to identify conservatism with fascism is, according to him, the "most damaging slander of all." The distinctive features of fascism are "plebeian leadership, the appeal to the mob, the contempt for legality, the disregard for the rights of property, the insistence on creating an entirely new order of things." If we examine the present Congress policy on this background, we can see who really are the fascists !

Hitler was perplexed when he found that world opinion was against him and he attributed it to international Jewry! Mr. Nehru is bewildered by adverse editorial opinions and attributes it to 'financial backing'. The case, both in cause and effect, is exceedingly similar. The contempt for legality and for judicial opinion, the disregard of the rights of property, the insistence on creating an entirely new order of things—these are unmistakably common to European fascism and to the Indian counterpart of it.

The present is a time when according to Mr. Chamberlain "freedom is much more threatened from the Left than from the Right". Conservatism, properly understood, says he, possesses values especially needed in this age "when the equality of man threatens the quality of man". True conservatism, according to Mr. Chamberlain, is interested in conserving property, because it is an almost indispensable support of personal liberty. Individual freedom will come to nothing if what has been earned lawfully and held is not protected by the law but made an uncertain thing by reason of the policies adopted for bringing into being a 'new order'. The freedom of avocation and the sacredness of possessions in the eye of the law—these are the flesh and blood of individual freedom, without which it cannot survive. The State must not seek to grow into a monster.

August 22, 1959 *Swarajya*

THE CALL OF THE NEW PARTY

THE new party and its programme are criticized by persons who have lost faith and rely only on compulsion for everything. The desire for compulsory improvement is incompatible with faith in the people and the principle of freedom. Mere regulation and interference cannot produce. For production we want

incentive, and it is this that the Swatantra Party seeks to preserve and protect.

Criticism takes the easy line of exaggerating the Swatantra Party's principle of freedom and reading into it the anarchy of total *laissez faire,* and then shouting 'here is rank folly'! It is a common trick to distort a thesis and find an easy antithesis to meet it. The Swatantra Party believes that initiative and enterprise, wherever operating, must be rewarded without seeking to put a ceiling on human enterprise. But at the same time the party holds that it is the duty of the State to protect those elements of society which need such protection. This should not be confused with politics that curb initiative and enterprise. Individual enterprise must be allowed its fullest expression. The party believes that without a substantial increase in national wealth, through increased production, it is wrong for a party to fasten on the State slogans which would cramp individual initiative and freedom by unnecessary and annoying regimentation through the bureaucratic machine. The policies of the Congress must lead to increasing official control and interference.

Public welfare is the only test by which economic policy should be justified and public welfare cannot be achieved except through the individual's freedom to live, to work, to think and to aspire. The party does not deny that the State has a part to play in industry. In certain recognized fields, such as communications and defence industries, the State has its legitimate field. Anyone who reads the principles adopted at the Bombay convention of the party will see that this is provided for. It may, in the interest of national welfare, if found necessary, enter into industries such as are of the nature of pioneering enterprises, or where the needed capital cannot be got otherwise. In such cases, the State should withdraw the moment private competitive enterprise can be drawn into them.

When capital is left and functions through private hands, it gives the greatest and most widely distributed scope for

employment. Socialism centralizes both power and capital in the State which is an organization inherently unfit for decentralized functioning or frugal management. It places intolerable authority in the hands of officials both big and petty. Centralization means waste, nepotism, delay and the corruption which accompanies all forms of monopolistic organization, especially under the paliamentary system where a political party seizes the power of interfering with economic life, and has ample motive to handle it for the maintenance of its own power. There is more potentiality in freedom than is generally realized and more harm in bartering it away for imaginary welfare than one now sees through spectacles clouded by jealousy and dislike of those who are a little better off than oneself. Individual freedom and enterprise are the most precious assets the nation has, and it is an illusion to attribute any positive value to the authority of the State in the matter of production of wealth. Beyond everything else, there can be no happiness in servile citizenship dominated at every turn by the tyranny of officials, who in turn work obediently for fulfilling the behests of a party organization. We have learnt enough from what has come to stay in the countries where reform and production by compulsion have been the State policy, enough to put us on guard against such a policy having increasing play in our own country. Totalitarianism in full action awaits us if we fail to strengthen the Swatantra Party.

The Swatantra Party has come into being to oppose totalitarianism, be it what the communists desire or what, in short-sighted competition with them, the Congress Party has adopted as its policy. Courage and full-hearted opposition to all attacks on freedom—this is the call of the new party.

August 29, 1959 *Swarajya*

THE PROVINCE OF RELIGION

> The *Ramayana* and the *Mahabharata* were woven into the texture of millions of lives in every generation for thousands of years. I have often wondered that if our race forgot the Buddha, the Upanishads and the great epics, what then will it be like? It would be uprooted and would lose the basic characteristics which have clung to it and given it distinction throughout these long ages. India would cease to be India.
>
> If religion deals not with dogmas and ceremonials but rather with the higher things of life, there should be no conflict with science or *inter se* between religions. It might be the high privilege of India to help in bringing about the synthesis. That would be India's ancient tradition inscribed in Ashoka's Edicts: 'The increase of spiritual strength is of many forms'.

THESE words and other connected thoughts expressed by Mr. Jawaharlal Nehru in his recent Azad Memorial address induced me to collect my thoughts on the subject of Faith and Science.

The culture that has grown in the great continent of India through the many thousands of years of her civilized history is something not only for pride but of value to the world. All culture according to Indian philosophy resolves itself into self-control in one form or another.

Good citizenship also resolves itself ultimately into self-control. True happiness, too, results from self-control and misery is the consequence of a lack of self-control. This is the Indian philosophy of life, but it is also a universal truth. Self-control is the supreme discipline for all intelligent men. This is what, the Upanishads, the *Gita* and the Buddha repeatedly told men, is most important in human life.

Human behaviour has to be controlled. It is more satisfactorily effected and more easily borne when there is no question of the coercion of a majority, or of any privileged minority, inflicting control through the institutions of government, but the required constant control comes from within, in the form of self-discipline as an automatic habit and as a form of worship of the Ruler of the Universe. We get this self-control accepted and practised with the least pain and the maximum satisfaction, not by law but by the force of religion, belief and practice until it crystallizes into personal habit and national culture.

Religion may be defined in this aspect as consisting of the behests of revered dead men. The behests of dead saints are more acceptable, more easily tolerated than the behests of living men, which is what control by law or government amounts to. The command of the majority in a democracy is not less irksome than the decree of a monarch or an oligarchy. But the command of a dead saint which forms the basis of self-discipline, which has no coercion behind it effectively, shapes human behaviour without unpleasantness until the individual feels it is his own will and the privilege of his cultured mind.

The physical law of cause and effect is unchangeable and from this issues the doctrine of determinism in respect of human behaviour also. Some philosophers hold that all human behaviour is pre-determined. The circumstances shape themselves according to the law of cause and effect. These and heredity, and other purely physical causes, bring about human behaviour. Some vague doubts have been cast on the physical law itself by the theories that have emerged about the movements of the fundamental particles of matter; but this does not materially affect the doctrine of determinism. The statistical law of averages is brought into the argument for determinism as against these doubts raised by modern science itself.

Whether, on the contrary, man has been endowed with free-will to act as he chooses, independent of the behests of the

theologian's God, as Milton repeatedly affirms in *Paradise Lost*, and independent of the force of heredity and material circumstances postulated by the biologists and the physicists, is still an unsolved question. The scientists have not totally yielded to the strong determinist bent of their pre-occupation. They still linger over some argument or other to make out free-will for the human mind. The inherent inclination of the human mind is to discover freedom for itself and to indulge at least in an illusion of freedom. The human mind established in its own dignity refuses to surrender to determinism, and loves to claim room to prefer of its own choice what it considers right to what it condemns as wrong. It is repugnant to the human mind, even of the scientist, to hold that God is just a cold mathematician and to allow man to renounce responsibility.

We are inclined to claim freedom when our action results in something pleasant or creditable. We are inclined the other way to be determinists, when it turns out to be something unpleasant or discreditable. Alone among all the things in the Universe, the human mind rebels against the imposition of dead mechanical order. The best theological solution is the Hindu doctrine of *leela*—the play of Isvara. This is a pleasant way of expressing the limitations of human enquiry. Man cannot adjudge or even understand the will of God or His plan, or even of His nature. Anthropomorphic attempts at understanding the Universe, not to speak of God the Author, necessarily end in error and futility.

The physicists are bound to favour determinism. But whatever be the truth, human duty and responsibility cannot be wiped out. They may be deemed to be only relative duties and not truth in the absolute sense. On that basis an ethic, some code of control of human behaviour, has a definite place in life. Freedom may be an illusion. But there *is* that illusion, and relative responsibility and duty issue from it.

No ethic can hang on itself. It must hang on a faith, a theory about the Universe. However convincing and irrefutable

the determinist position may be within the compass of dynamics, and however exhaustive the physical explanation of the phenomena of the Universe may be, there is still the residual question of the origin of it all. We seek causes at every step in the physical sciences. We refuse to rest until we find them. How can we suddenly stop that urge when we reach the stage beyond which we cannot travel? This residual question is not answered by the discovery of unqualified and unchangeable order in the Universe. It must remain reverently unanswered. It is the basis of the humility called Religion.

A formula in respect of the unknowable region that remains and must remain unexplored by science is essential for man, to choose good and reject evil. Even if there be no freedom to choose the Good in preference to Evil and man is just a plaything of the 'gods', the fact remains that the best men somehow prefer or appear to prefer the unpleasant Right to the most attractive Wrong, and they feel this in their own hearts as a free preference. Man cannot, he will not, give up Religion as long as we all agree that self-control is essential for happiness—one's own true happiness as well as the welfare of others around us.

Therefore, we come to the conclusion that governments must support religion. They need not and should not support a particular religion but should support all religions that are not wedded to immorality. The Upanishads saw this and laid it down. The *Gita* did the same. Ashoka did it in his Edicts. Governments cannot afford to be 'secular'. Their impartiality and refusal to support particular religions need not have been given this wrong name. 'Secular' does not express the position of positive support to all religions alike. It is out of Faith that spiritual values flow and Faith, if it is broadly identical among a large mass of people, is Religion.

In the days of infant science, religions included many branches of material knowledge also. The Veda of the Hindus was an encyclopaedia of knowledge in all departments. Specia-

lization took place gradually and the growing knowledge of the world of matter was finally extricated from religion. This led to religion being gradually freed from the incubus of departments of knowledge subject to development and change, and from the consequential contradictions, that for a long time discredited and puzzled piety. Today these sources of contradictions must be wholly removed from the field of religion. It is not good for religion to have its own astronomy or physics or medicine, while the sciences of astronomy, physics and medicine are making rapid strides forward giving up old theories and adopting new ones. Religion must confine itself to its own proper field thereby giving no room for contradictions with science. Science would then not come into conflict with religion which belongs to a region outside science altogether.

The use to which science is to be put is not a matter of science but a question of right conduct which must fall within the bounds of ethics and therefore of religion. The nature of bacteriological or nuclear poison is a matter of science. But the use of it in war would be an ethical or religious question. All the means and strategies employed in war are science but the limits to which means and strategies could go, and the manner in which wars may be conducted, are matters of conduct falling within the field of morality and religion. The oft-mentioned conflicts between religion and politics, religion and science are all products of confusion in this respect, pure fallacies. There can be in the matter of conduct no two standards, one to be actually followed in politics or commerce and another to be regarded as religious ideals without being followed in worldly transactions. All conduct must accept and follow the restraints enjoined in religion, be it the *Gita* or the *Bible* or any other scripture. The ethical restraints of human conduct cannot be treated as something different from worldly affairs, to be kept apart from human conduct itself.

It is futile to imagine that the affairs of a people do not fall within the jurisdiction of the codes of religion regarding human

conduct. Nations are individuals living together and combining their individual efforts. Their rights and duties are not of a class different from the rights and duties of individuals. It would be merely a trick of evasion to make such a distinction. The human conduct such as is sought to be controlled by the codes of various religions is not merely the personal conduct of some (a small or large number of) individuals but the conduct of *every* individual and therefore of them all combined. The whole cannot escape from the restraints placed on the component parts. Nations cannot, therefore, claim to be free from the ethical principles that are good for the component individuals. India has a mission in this respect. May the guidance she gets be in furtherance of this mission.

Recently the Church Peace Union of America distributed in India a book by Ernest Lefever in a cheap edition. The book seeks to prove that ethics should have nothing to do with foreign policy. We are told therein that 'Judaeo-Christian' ethics attributes sin to man, that this original sin attaches to politics, and specially to foreign policy, and that therefore we should not complain if foreign policy deviates from morality or from the teachings of Jesus. One wonders what Christ or Paul would have said to this. It would seem that the Church Peace Union lends its authority to the frustration of the object of the Son-of-God's incarnation on earth on the basis of a doctrine of the inevitability of sin.

This leads us to the capital question of how we shall conquer ill-will and suspicion, and establish peace. Blessed are the Peace-Makers. And how shall we make peace?

There is no way but by example and unilateral action, and the acceptance of all the hazards contained in such unilateral action. Some things are hard to dissolve in any fluid, except in a particular liquid. Hatred and suspicion can be dissolved only in the uncalculating unilateral steps taken by the more courageous party. Courage consists not in the organization

of self-defence and retaliation but in the un-negotiated step taken in disregard of fear and suspicion.

When both parties are in a dangerously strong position, distrust and fear continue through any negotiation that might be attempted and render it impossible of successful conclusion. If the hazards of unilateral action are ruled out, all approaches to peace are closed and only balanced terror can prevail as the alternative to hot conflict and disaster. Unilateral action is a policy essentially rooted in religion; and when this is not available, Peace such as we want is automatically ruled out. The principle of unilateral action has a palce even in negotiation at every step therein, if the latter is to succeed and not end in failure, leaving the position worse than it was before.

Nothing else can dissolve suspicion and fear. There is much more power in brave unilateral action than in $E = MC^2$; power that builds, not destroys, builds lasting human progress and civilization. The point the West, including Russia, has reached after discarding religious values has brought the world again to a truer vision of these discarded values. The road to Religion must now be taken or else we shall be lost.

July-September 1959 *Quest*

UNILATERAL ANNOUNCEMENT BY U.S.

Cast thy bread upon the waters: for thou shalt find it after many days. —ECCLESIASTES

WHATEVER the other compelling circumstances that brought about the present announcement of suspension of tests by the U.S. with its corollary of a follow-suit by Britain, there is much

reason for congratulation on the steady but slow progress of the principle of unilateral action.

A great deal of barren cynicism exploded when Khrushchov announced his unilateral suspension of tests for the first time eighteen months ago. But as some of us all over the world firmly believe, there is greater moral power in right action, unilaterally undertaken, than people see in this befogged materialist age when so little beyond physical phenomena is visible to the eye. Whe have now seen that the idea of unilateral action has at last become familiar, instead of being a strange faddist notion. The practicality of it and its potentiality have now become patent even to the hard-boiled realists and physicists.

The Geneva nuclear conference has laid a firm foundation for advance. It has recorded the unanimous acceptance of the principle that treaties of abstention from test explosions shall be subject to abrogation as and when any of the nuclear Powers who are parties to the treaty is found guilty of evasion that can be publicly stated and proved. This formula has successfully met that problem of mutual suspicion. Condemnation by world opinion has definitely found its place as a sanction for international morality.

Russia cannot legitimately be deprived of the honour of having first initiated unilateral action, and it is a good sign that the cynicism that was directed against the Russian announcement of cessation of tests in March 1958 is not repeated against the present U.S. announcement, although the latter has qualified it with all the conditions that qualified the first Russian unilateral gesture. I recall the reply from Mr. Khrushchov in December 1957 to my letter to him pleading for unilateral action on Russia's part. The press of the West wrote jubilantly then, broadcasting the polite refusal of the U.S.S.R. Premier to my proposal. Since December 1957 there has been so great a change in the outlook of nuclear Powers that now we have unilateral suspension announced by the U.S.A. I believe that now we are near the

haven and that this programme of the great Powers to poison the world will be stopped and forgotten. The fear arising from nuclear weapons is at the root of the cold war. It gives the monster its life and its resistance to commonsense. There is now the 'authentic' Ike moving round to create a welcome atmosphere for Khrushchov's American visit. May Providence bless these endeavours and help us all to be released from the hell we have created for ourselves with the assistance of science. Unilateral action is the sovereign plan and the only weapon with which we can cut the various vicious circles in which the world is at present entangled.

September 5, 1959 *Swarajya*

A CONVINCING PROOF

THERE has been a spectacular demonstration that experience and honesty are sometimes seen in action at the cost of prestige. Mr. Ajit Prasad Jain has demonstrated by his resignation his violent dissent from the policy of State trading sought to be pursued in trembling obedience to the communist dogma. The last Food Minister has confessed that he had found it impossible to make the State trading policy succeed unless there are annoying 'controls' enforced all round. This is a *reductio ad absurdum,* if the Congress has any shred of wisdom or respect for freedom left. If State trading must lead to controls and rationing, and all the annoyance, corruption and misery that the people so violently revolted against during the rationing days, it is high time the ruling party confesses and drops its subservience to communist slogans and find other ways of maintaining its power than that of urging people to hate communism but to adopt its economic and social doctrines.

Policies and statements of the ruling party are destroying interest in agriculture and investment in trade and industry. Agricultural land values have gone down. There are people to sell but no one to buy. Money floats about without anchorage anywhere except in banks and government securities. Investment in land which from countless ages back was the most 'guilt-edged' security that people prized has now fallen to the lowest point. Uncertainty is the predominant climate for all enterprise. The State is getting back all its printed money.

It is not a sign of prosperity or confidence that the loans floated by Government are immediately subscribed but a demonstration of the falling interest in productive enterprises. It is a case of monetary diarrhoea. There is a failure of digestion and absorption.

The principal revenue of the States, viz., the various sales taxes are all being converted into Central excise revenue with doles to the States. The Central hunger for funds and the eagerness to get it all somehow is destroying the Constitution. The federal structure is being demolished through financial subversion. The States are reduced to grant-fed humble organizations depending on the single party Government at the Centre. There is no resistance to this in the States, because the party organization is centralized completely except for personal power, gerrimandering and corruption which are allowed and even encouraged at the lower levels. Power of a lower type has fullest play in the States for the very reason that the 'High Command' at the Centre which governs the decisions of the party throughout the country wants powerful agents at the regional end, whose influence must be kept up at any cost. India is becoming a unitary, totalitarian State in spite of the Constitution which began with an objective resolution to the effect that the various regions formed into the Union of India will "possess and retain the status of autonomous units together with residuary powers." The first sentence of the Constitution that "India shall be a Union of States" is being rapidly made into a fiction, and Delhi is

attaining the position of a single totalitarian authority over all India. The official machine is getting bigger and bigger and more and more a complete regulating authority over private life and endeavour. The State swells and the people shrink, to use the words of a great historian of the past.

September 5, 1959 *Swarajya*

B. C. G. IN THE LOK SABHA

The Minister for Health announced (on September 2) in the Lok Sabha that a 'special team' appointed for the purpose had reported that B.C.G. vaccine "was producing the allergy that was needed for protection against tuberculosis". This assumes that, in the case of tuberculosis, allergy is protection, which assumption is not warranted by what doctors have seen. In answering question put in the House, the Minister replied that "the people vaccinated were not kept under observation and it was physically impossible to do so". This is like saying it is possible to weigh and measure accurately only when the customers are few in number but, if there is a long queue before the grain shop, such precision is not possible and is therefore given up.

The vaccination undertaken, world doctors have repeatedly warned, has no value unless vaccinated individuals are kept under observation and tested. Inductive demonstration has not yet passed B.C.G. Those who really know about this subject understand that testing itself becomes complicated and difficult as a result of the vaccination. Close vaccination observation and proper testing are insisted on by all experts in preventive medicine.

Mass vaccination of B.C.G. had been up in all Western countries. It is unscientifically persisted in only in our country.

It is not accepted by the better class of medical professors in the world that the allergy produced by inoculation is any protection in itself, in the case of tuberculosis. It is a mere superstition which the Health Minister has repeated, that 'allergy' is 'protection'. A perusal of the latest article on this subject signed by over fifteen high grade medical experts, which appeared in *The British Medical Journal* (June 6, 1959), a summary of which has appeared in *Swarajya* of July 18, will throw considerable light on the question, and convince readers that the B.C.G. campaign in India and the money spent on it was sheer waste of health, energy and public funds. It is another instance of how mere expenditure of funds allotted is taken for work and achievement. A grant from abroad for experimentation in our country, so rich in docile people, persuades a huge waste of our own tax money. The mere fact of the initial employment of a large number of men in a particular department or activity creates a vested interest in keeping that activity alive on the basis of reports of 'special teams'.

September 12, 1959 *Swarajya*

UNFORTUNATE SET-BACK

DOES the Prime Minister realize that the good impression produced among the Non-Hindi people by his recent speech on the subject of India's Central official languages has been almost completely destroyed by the Home Minister's long speech in the Lok Sabha commending the report of the Language Commission and leaving things as they are? The lengthy excursion into the subject made by Mr. Ballabh Pant has neutralized all the good the Prime Minister did. The non-Hindi people feel exactly what they felt a year ago. Their doubts and fears and difficulties have been really redoubled. The speech of the Prime Minister has been clean by-passed by the later pronouncement which,

through its long and winding course, leans on the whole to strengthen the provisions of the Constitution decreeing a change over from English to an unknown medium. This threat glares at us like the flaming eyes of a tiger at night in the wilderness.

The Prime Minister has repeated his personal assurance in Parliament on Friday, but he definitely refused to carry the case any further. "But for the moment, I do not think," said Mr. Nehru on Friday, "it could be reasonably argued that any language other than Hindi would be very suitable for the purposes of official language." Surely, English has served these purposes and can continue to do so. He has said quite enough to help the Hindi protagonists to do exactly what they have been doing. The demand for a clear amendment of the Constitution suspending the Hindi provision or at least a resolution of Parliament to that effect remains justified. It is not, as the Prime Minister suggested, a question only of 'fear' or of recruitment. It is the simple concrete question of what language the work in the Central departments should be done in. If there is any change in it, it is *ipso facto* an imposition on each and all of the States. It is not a case of assurances as to recruitment. To what work are they recruited? Is it to an office doomed to change over to Hindi or is it to an office as it had been all these years? What non-Hindi people want is that all-India work should be done in a medium which their intelligentsia are familiar with, and not in Hindi.

Dr. A. Krishnaswami spoke briefly and well. Every word he said is true. The non-Hindi people desire that the whole chapter on the official language should be suspended by Parliament. A resolution to this effect sponsored by the Prime Minister will alone give the quietus to the issue. His assuring words have been ignored and his policy has been rendered nought by what the President and the Home Minister have said thereafter. The game of sweet speech and simultaneous and relentless executive prosecution of the Hindi imperialist plan, will go on

unless a definite resolution is passed by Parliament directing that the whole chapter in the Constitution (Part XVII) be suspended until Parliament directs the re-opening of the question. This should be done now. Suggestions that Parliament may extend the reprieve after 1965 are of no use. The apprehensions of the non-Hindi areas should be dispelled now. All pro-Hindi administrative orders and directions hitherto issued or attempted hereafter should be made invalid and unconstitutional on the ground of discrimination in favour of one class of Indian citizens to the detriment of other large classes. The States must be left free to deal with their own affairs in the matter of language and the English medium should be left undisturbed at the Centre.

The latest report about the circulation of newspapers in India confirms indisputably the position that for wide and even distribution English holds the field all over the country and Hindi lags far behind and is really a localized medium for the literate. No fair-minded person can ignore this patent fact and seek to force Hindi on the Central departments in the conduct of which every unit in the Indian Union is equally interested.

India has many languages of which a few could be lumped together as Hindi if we ignore the differences that in India make one language different from another. Those that speak the other languages should not be forgotten. The only democratic solution has been enunciated by the Prime Minister. Without the clear agreement of the Non-Hindi people nothing by way of discrimination in favour of Hindi should be done directly or indirectly, openly or through surreptitious administrative favours and disfavours. Hindi protagonists should drop their illusions and their fear of peace over this issue. Nothing is gained by zeal that is looked upon as an imperialistic drive. Those who guide the destinies of India cannot ignore the millions who do not know Hindi and who form a substantial part of the nation and claim to be as important as any other section of the people.

The goal of a single new official Indian language should be definitely given up. It should be unequivocally admitted that English must continue to function as it has done these hundred and fifty years.

September 12, 1959 *Swarajya*

WANTON ATTRIBUTION OF MOTIVES

We want an Opposition party, every one admits. Democracy cannot go steadily on, it can only hop or limp without an Opposition.

There must be an alternative to the ruling party. Democracy will collapse and discover itself as totalitarianism if this alternative and Opposition are not provided.

But when someone brings up an opposition, the cry is, 'it is not good,' it won't do; it hurts; it is a team of angry men; how can any sane person oppose the Congress?

If men who have been so far in politics and in the Congress come forward to lead an opposition, the shout is, "Oh how inconsistent; they were in the Congress all along, and they now say things they did not say before!"

If new personalities come, the objection is, "These people who had kept aloof all along, what do they know about things? They are dangerous men, because they are not politicians."

This world, and the congressmen with it, have lost the art of examining things objectively. The method of reason is discarded in favour of an analysis of plausible or possible motives,

affiliations and plots that can be alleged against personalities. This is deemed to be sound criticism and good political thinking.

"Oh don't we know X?"

"Oh Rajaji is angry: frustrated ambition, don't you see?"

God knows that I do not want any office. I do not want it, even if I should be called irresponsible for that very reason. I was compelled by Mr. Nehru's affectionate remonstrances to continue much beyond the time when I wished to leave Delhi. And when I did come away I did so against his wishes. I have held and finished with the highest offices open to anyone. I have received honours and tokens of utmost regard and affection, for all of which I am grateful.

It is folly to suggest anger or frustration of ambition as the reason for my opposition and its varieties, or for my not believing that prosperity and progress can be built in our land by blundering imitation of communist techniques.

If progress has to be slow, let us be patient. It cannot be made to go fast on the shoulders of Government officials pushing and jostling against one another or through fostering class-hatred. Class-hatred is too heavy a price for votes. We want a party that believes in all classes working together.

September 16, 1959 *Current*

ADMISSION OF CHINA IN U. N.

THE refusal of the United States of America to agree to the admission of China in the U.N. has created numerous difficulties. When facts are ignored and fictions encouraged, the path to

correct decisions is made difficult. Some people believe that China should be 'punished' by being refused admission. They think that admission would amount to condonation of her offences. This is not good sense but only anger. It is believed that the presence of Russia is a historical accident and that this error should not be aggravated by the deliberate addition of China. It is wrong to act as if the U.N. were only a cold war organization of the West.

The true purpose of the U.N. is Peace and not to serve as an instrument for conflict. The U.N. has, it is true, not succeeded in solving differences at basic level, but it has served to prevent or alleviate conflicts. Mutually understood language and debate are better than a shooting war and that is what the U.N. was planned for. It has done, and can do, a great deal in this way.

Divorce is not the way to married life. We cannot bring self-discipline into being if we refuse 'board and bed' to the party to be brought under discipline. India has continually sought to impress this truth on America but unfortunately the asylum given to Chiang Kai-shek has stood in the way. A long enough trial has been given for the fiction that Chiang Kai-shek continues to represent China. He and his army do not entertain any hope of reconquering China. That civil conflict has ended and Britain has recognized the fact. If any legal fiction must continue, it may be limited to the satellite State of Formosa and not allowed to be a mist to cover the reality of China.

China must be brought into the U.N. even as Russia occupies a seat there. It should be left to China to refuse the invitation to join and be its own denouncer. It may be predicted that it will not be allowed by its great ally to be guilty of such suicidal folly. Once China is a member, all conflicts would be brought under open discussion. India has long been pleading for this. It is not a new request arising out of the recent incidents on the Himalayan border. These have brought the question into

bright focus. The best aid that America could give to India at the present moment, better than any other form of assistance, is to agree to invite China to join the U.N. It would also be the best assistance America could give to Tibet. It would, last and most important of all, be the best move towards world peace. Any further delay on this issue of admission of China into the world peace organization would be disservice to the cause of world peace in general and to that of India in particular. It would be very shortsighted policy to be gratified with the present rift between India and China and hope for its widening still further and not take the only step that has to be taken, *viz.*, to admit China in the U.N. and thereby bring that government under the jurisdiction of ordered world debate where it will have a fair chance of stating and defending its own positions before submitting to world opinion or stand exposed as unresaonable.

September 19, 1959 *Swarajya*

RESPONSE TO THE NEW PARTY

> Amidst today's commotion I thought of myself as a bird that has plunged for some good reason into water; when it is in danger of drowning, the gods change its feathers into fins. The fish that go to its help cannot understand why it does not feel at home directly in their element.
>
> —GOETHE (in a letter to Frau Von Stein)

THE quotation above from one of Goethe's letters describes my condition. I have plunged into this unpleasant work of forming a new political party for very good reasons. The gods have been gracious to me and they enable me almost to forget my years. But the fish about me in this water cannot understand why I feel uncomfortable all the same.

The new party is the answer to the challenge of the Government's totalitarian invasion on the freedom of the individual and all that hitherto was deemed to be inviolabe, and furnished the motive and the incentive for life and activity. It is also an answer to the challenge of political corruption and the fall or moral standards all round and the growing disregard of *dharma.* The mind of the nation has revolted. Hence the widespread response to our movement. We must watch and keep ourselves qualified to take up this latter challenge. We cannot do it if we copy the very evils we propose to fight. This is as true and important as the fact which we have taken up as our basic complaint, that the Congress cannot answer the challenge of communism by *itself* copying and carrying out communism's own policies.

Friends as well as opponents speak against some men who have joined the party and point out their alleged shortcomings. A movement throws its doors open to all. It is not a social club with ballot boxes and 'black balls' to keep out unwanted men. We cannot carry on like cliques and small clubs selecting and shutting out those whom we don't like for some reason or other. Faults get burnt off in the crisis we face. Everyone's offer must be accepted as Rama accepted Vibhishana's. I need not quote from the story of Christ. If our aim is justified, that is, if it is true that there is a crisis and a call for a new party, that climate itself purifies. The history of individuals seemingly adverse often becomes an asset of experience instead of being a liability. We have all so much slag in us that we cannot afford to point it out in others. Let us hope the fire will look to it. I am not writing this as a wishful thought from cloudland, but as a very useful and practical approach. We must go forward confidently and not listen to the voice of suspicion and fear. We are no doubt forming a political party, but it is esentially a movement and an urge for purity. The mind of the nation is at work and we fulfil a felt want. We may boldly trust ourselves to its purging quality.

September 19, 1959 *Swarajya*

QUEST FOR ABSOLUTE SECURITY

WRITING about Khrushchov's visit to America, Walter Lippman has contributed an article which is at once very important and very unsatisfactory. He rightly points out that the Russians direct all their energies with a sense of purpose and this accounts for their astounding success. As against this, he deplores the absence of a 'sense of true purpose' in his own people. They do not realize the might of the adversary, he says. He deprecates their fear of being seduced by Mr. Khrushchov's witchery. "Become again the confident and purposeful people," he winds up, "which except when we have doped ourselves, we really are."

What is the 'purpose' which will rehabilitate and which he asks the Americans to develop as their guiding genius? And here is Lippman's anti-climax. It is shocking and disgraceful, he says, that America which is so rich has not had the purpose or the will to keep from falling behind in the rocket competition. This is the 'purpose' he places before his people as what will put them spiritually on level with the miracle of Russia. He explains and supplements this prescription by complaining that sufficient attention has not been given to providing an adequate school system, the need of 'the age we live in'.

Surely rockets are not the great ambition for which America should arise and awake. It is not for making more successful rockets that children should be fitted by early training. It is not this deficiency in education that keeps America in a fallen state. Indeed, America is not in such a state and Walter Lippman has gone all wrong in his diagnosis. America's heart is sound, her health is good. She need not feel depressed for an imaginary defect.

Water Lippman's appeal sounds so jejune against Khrushchov's resounding appeal for total disarmament in four years coupled with the claim that it is not mere fancy but a realistic plan capable of being worked out if purposeful statesmanship decided to do it.

Indeed Lippman's appeal itself brings out this nature of the disease he has sought to diagnose, the fear of being outwitted by an enemy nation. Lippman's advice is only an expression of the very complex he deprecates.

What America needs doing is to re-read her own history and recover her spiritual courage, not rocket-building or reshaping her educational system to that purpose. A great nation can do no better than occasionally—especially whenever there is a sense of crisis—to go through a refresher course of its own history, and study how its life began and grew strong. Therein will be found the best nourishment and health-giving tonic. And therein America will find the secret of happiness which is what one seeks at the end of everything else. The quest for absolute security which is now the dominant passion is as futile as wrong. This quest becomes in the net result a quest for power against every other nation, singly or combined. For, he who is friend today can be an inveterate enemy or an unreliable ally some time hence, as we have already seen in so many instances. It needs no argument to demonstrate that such a quest for power is untenable as a noble or attainable goal. Happiness either of individuals or of nations is to be found otherwise, not in power or absolute security. The individual and the aggregate national soul should learn to be unperturbed, and develop the capacity to cause no fear in any one and this will at the same time and automatically destroy one's fear of others. This is the purpose to which all thought and all energy should be directed and not to the objects for which the Russian purpose has been framed under communist direction. Mr. Khrushchov's present activities demonstrate that he has realized the futility of that purpose. He wants peace, not in respect of a particular

international situation, but peace in general out of which true happiness will issue. There is much truth in what Jacques Barzun deplores in his book *House of Intellect.* He has proved by a hundred and one paradoxes that Intellect has been displaced by public opinion cultivated through mass media, and that salvation lies in the reversal of this usurpation and the restoration of Intellect to its sovereignty, which alone can lead the human mind to truth.

Mr. Adlai Stevenson is certain Mr. Khrushchov is sincere in his disarmament proposals. This great and genuine change in Soviet policy, Mr. Adlai Stevenson believes, might be the result of what the Russian leader saw in his American tour. But the cause is deeper than a fleeting emotion. The Soviet leader has seen the futility of it all much more definitely than others, for unlike others he has applied his powers of reasoning to the problem without fear and therefore without bias. Khrushchov came to America with his mind clear about it. Is it not possible that he arrived at his firm answer to the challenge of the age and declared it on behalf of his people just because he felt like that after going round places in America ? In his own words, which I believe were uttered more seriously than this professed unbeliever wishes to make it appear to others, God has helped the intelligent. The daring and the greatness of his total disarmament plan are inspired by the Higher Power. It needs more than ritual faith to understand and accept the advice which the Soviet unbeliever has given and which marks a progress in civilization truly greater than the deadly achievements of the scientists and technicians.

October 1959 *Indian Foreign Affairs*

THE STATE OF THE UNION

THE Congress Party has decided to disregard the boundaries of private rights and extend the State's authority in all fields. It is committed to this ruinous policy. Ministers may go and ministers may come. But the Congress Party has tied its policy round its neck for ever. There are defeatists who do not want this invasion on fundamental rights but they are tired and would rather not keep on fighting. They are old warriors but now feel tired. And, therefore, they think there is 'much to be said' for the Government's point of view. This attitude of balance arising out of weariness is reflected in numerous ways. I am translating a great writer's words about how Intellect has lost faith in itself and surrenders without a struggle to cliches and their consequence, misguided public opinion.

"The Delhi Praja Socialist Party expressed its grave concern on Saturday over the growing menace of anti-social elements in Delhi and the authorities' failure to deal with it." So reports *The Hindustan Times* in its issue of September 20.

'Family quarrels on the increase' is the headline for another news item in the same issue. It says : "More husbands and wives of Delhi want the police to protect them from their partners than ever before."

An official press release of this month tells us that an income-tax officer was awarded eighteen months' rigorous imprisonment, being convicted on a charge of entering into a conspiracy and issuing income-tax refund orders in the names of persons who either did not exist or were not entitled to such refunds. Income-tax officers are high grade persons specially 'selected' and entrusted with great powers over citizens engaged in business and professions. That they are authorized to issue

refund orders indicates their status. That crimes of the sort brought out in this case have tempted such high class officials of the Central Government demonstrates the mentality that has been produced by the unceasing efforts of the Government to adore Mammon as the national God of this so-called nuclear age in which we are exhorted not to allow ourselves to be left behind.

The inner law has been sabotaged by the present cult of increasing the standard of living without reference to the quality of that life and by the focussing of thought on the acquisition of material income and a secular, that is, a negative attitude towards *dharma* and religion. Party workers have trained the people of the slums everywhere to expect money in all elections. 'Mass contact' only means this or the spread of class hatred against the so-called rich and nothing else.

The steady flow of all power and all resources towards Delhi is going on and the emasculation of State governments is progressing apace. The ultimate goal is that all State governments shall function as district boards to spend money out of grants received from the Centre and the States-list in Schedule VII of the Constitution will be reduced to a dead letter by 'consent' of the legislatures, luring them with greater sums by way of grants. The sales taxes were the only flexible and substantial revenue for the State governments and these have been gradually transferred to the Central revenue, the tax on one commodity after another being converted into excise.

Now comes a proposal for wholly completing the scheme of transfer. One of the most important arguments advanced for this devolution of power from the States to the Centre deserves the attention of those who claim to protect the poor : "If th States handle the sales taxes they will have to provide exempting shops whose total turnover is below a certai mum. It is politically impossible to avoid this." " Centre argues, "transfer it all to excise and we

everything at the source of production so that nobody escapes the levy. That is the advantage of excise over sales tax. Every consumer of universally wanted articles will then pay the tax when he makes his purchases at a shop small or big." We see here the real object. The economic advisers of the Central Government have told them that the limit has been reached in the taxation of the rich and they must now tax the poor, the bulk of the people. They are large in numbers and their consumption of essential and universally consumed articles will give a large revenue. So the Centre recommends the transfer of all the sales taxes on commonly consumed articles to Central excise.

Concealed tax levied through excise at the source of production will be covered and protected from popular attack by the mist of rising prices and the public can be made to pay without their knowing that what they pay is not the price of the article, but indirect tax.

Here is a pincer movement of the Government. State trading on the one side and excise on all articles of consumption on the other, between the two the consumer is to be squeezed into paying for all the wasteful megalomania of the rulers who believe in international show-windows rather than in the happiness of the people.

Ocotber 3, 1959 *Swarajya*

PLEA FOR SEATING CHINA IN U. N.

co

pers Adlai Stevenson, in his television interview on September refunds lled upon the United States Government to cease leading 'selected'-admission lobby againsts China in the United Nations. in busines led that the question should be left to the free and

untrammelled decision of the members of that body "without interference from America." He said that the leadership of the United States' in opposing China's admission had drawn all the opposition on America and much criticism from America's own allies. Mr. Adlai Stevenson very rightly said, "If Red Chinese delegates were in the United Nations, then they would have to answer almost daily for some of the things they have done of late that have provoked indignation in the whole world."

The reality cannot be ignored for all time. Some day it has to be faced and is it not better, as Mr. Stevenson has said, that it be done quickly?

The question is what conception one has of the United Nations. If it is looked upon as an important propaganda forum for the Western block in the cold war, the present American policy of leading the opposition to the admission of one more communist nation in it is right. But if, as was generally claimed, the United Nations is a world forum and instrument of peace, that policy is all wrong and must be reversed as Mr. Adlai Stevenson recommends. It may be added, if but to assure America and her allies, that the admission will not take away from the use to which the U.N. can be put in the cold war. An attack on the guilty is more effective by way of proof, if an opportunity is also given for answering the charges than if it is mere *ex parte* accusation. Every consideration points to the desirability of admission. It is a matter for gratification that the Democratic leader of America has at this juncture unequivocally recommended the revision of American policy in this respect and pleaded for the admission of China. It is unwise to give some of the allied delegates in the U.N. good justification to say, as has been reported, "We would not like to embarrass an ally in the election year. Otherwise, we would vote the other way." Unreal conceptions and cold war votes in the U.N. do not make for world peace. We cannot hit the moon with our rocket if we take some other near and controllable body for the moon. We cannot make true astronomy, or

astrology either, if we create *benami* (Indian word for fiction) moons and planets to our liking and base our calculation on them. The U.N. should do away with *benamis* and recognize and deal with real China and treat Formosa as what it is and not what it wishes to be.

There was ill-concealed jubilation in many quarters of the great world when reports of the Chinese aggression on the Indian borders were broadcast. There was a definite national swing towards the West and unthinking men thought even of possible war. It is gratifying that the Prime Minister declared again India's policy of non-alignment when he was at Teheran on September 22. Neither non-alignment nor the principle of co-existence is affected, he said, "by the misuse of it by some people or some countries not acting up to it". He does not believe in controlled and inspected non-alignment as some people would have him do. The fever over the Sino-Indian incidents has cooled off.

October 3, 1959 *Swarajya*

PLIGHT OF OUR RURAL FOLK

FAILURE to achieve good government has the effect on our rulers of bringing into being stunts to divert attention. And when these stunts are misconceived the harm is doubled. The present rulers of India have no aggressive foreign policy to turn popular attention away from internal failures, as is the case with some other governments. Hence the Congress Party offers to make all landless people into landed proprietors ! An all poor people into rich men enjoying leisure ! How ? By the simple panacea of a declared socialist pattern and a legislative drive towards it. 'Ceilings on land,' said Mr. Nehru. 'Ceilings not only on land

but on all incomes,' says Mr. Sanjeeva Reddy. It does not matter that there is no wealth. We must begin distributing it.

Had these stunts remained only as Delhi slogans there would have been no serious harm. But the Centre has transferred the slogans to the States where the electoral managers are busy working them out into bills for the legislature and into the reality of oppression and folly.

I saw a ryot—one who is by birth classed as a backward class man—who said he had a two-third of a square mile of land irrigated by rain-fed small tanks which has supported his large family in fair comfort, according to rural standards. He said he would have to divide the large family, of which he is the head, into separate units so that his acres may be saved from the proposed ceilings law. When the family likes to stay together, what a pity it is to break it up just to escape from a bad law ! The Government breaks up existing co-operation based on family affection and traditional attachment wherein women and young people, all work together with a sense of security. And after breaking up what is already there, real and effective, the new policy seeks to bring together strangers in a subsidized co-operative wherein they are to increase production by joint effort after giving up their separate titles in all but paper, and after losing the status which gives them position and credit among the rural folk as men who own their own land.

Alas for reality, and alas for our rural folk who are all to be trained in the socialist culture of being afraid of officials and being always dependent on their good reports to the Government.

I was amazed to find from a blue book containing a great big official committee's report that the Bihar ryots are now, after the abolition of the feudal zemindars, paying as land revenue more than six times what they were paying as rent to the zemindar. The State has converted itself into a zemindar worse

than the one liquidated and is demanding a price for the land which always belonged to the ryot and which it now pretends to sell to him on hire purchase system !

October 3, 1959 *Swarajya*

NEW SUPERSTITIONS FOR OLD

It is a common trick of domestic politics to bring into prominence something to divert attention from the ruling party's failures. Foreign policies are often invented for this purpose. Class hatred too may serve in this manner to divert popular attention, and it seems this fatal experiment is being made.

In answer to the charge that the policies of the present government are generating the terrible poison of class hatred, both the Prime Minister and the Congress President, his daughter, answer in justification (from the new capital of the Punjab) that conflict and hatred are inherent under feudal conditions. They do not deny but seem, on the contrary, proud of their approach and talk of fierce claws and sharp teeth. Everyone knows whose claws and teeth are now red and sharp. After twelve years have passed since Gandhiji's assassination, the Congress has, on the eve of the anniversary of the Mahatma's birthday this year, definitely and openly opted for what he abominated, hatred and conflict. This is most deplorable. They talk of feudalism. Where is feudalism in India now ? No one is forced to work or yield anything by force or tradition to his superior. The zemindari system of collecting land revenue had been abolished and this was done not by the new socialist Congress but more than twenty years back and some of us in the new party were as responsible for the abolition as others now in the Congress. Tenancy reform too had been taken up in the pre-socialism days. Those who in Bihar for generations thought the land they tilled was

their own are now made to pay to the Government fifteen times the annual tribute they had been paying to the liquidated zemindar. In fact, the government has become a single all-State Zemindar now and a worse type than those who have been turned out, one who seeks to get hire-purchase money from those who owned the land, as if they were now buying new land. The present talk about feudalism is just witch-hunting. All impartial observers and those interested in increased production, who know what is going on, know that the boot of tyranny is in the other leg now, whether it be agriculture or industry. It is nonsense to describe the relationship between management and workers as one of feudalism. No industry can get on without workers or without management. It is not a case for abolition or hatred but one for every effort being made for bringing into being harmony. The formulae of feudalism and inherent conflict are parrot cries of exploded communist slogans. It is a matter for profound grief that apart from seeking to make expropriation and interference with individual freedom of occupation lawful, there is now an open commitment to a programme of deceptive phrases and the generation and intensification of hatred and disharmony. It is an irony of fate that this coincides with Gandhi Week this year. The glorification of technology and the ridicule of the customs of the people may pass for modernity, but it is gross folly. The substitution of new superstitions for old is going on apace. It is all tragic irreverence and intoxication of power and position. The people of India must pray that the gods may bless their present rulers with a little humility if not wisdom, during their brief tenure of office.

Mr. Jawaharlal Nehru has made a long speech to the members of the Congress Party assembled in an A.I.C.C. meeting, in the course of which he expressed his difficulty in understanding what the Swatantra Party's stand was. His difficulty in understanding what the Swatantra Party stands for is of his own making. If one proposes to understand what a party stands for, by recalling one's own prejudices, pre-conceived notions and guessing the motives of the personalities concerned, one must fail.

One will only come round that way to one's own pre-conceived ideas and prejudices. The straight and easy path to understand our party is to read what has been said in the twenty-one short articles of the Party's foundation document. There is no ambiguity or prolixity in it.

The Prime Minister said with reference to the Swatantra Party :

> Mr. Rajagopalachari has got a medley of companions in the Swatantra Party and it is difficult to know what their stand is. But broadly speaking, he stands for the perpetuation of the traditional system, leaving the industrialists to go ahead and do what they like. Ultimately they will change the system but on a different plane than I would like it to be. But I don't see how by means of that traditional system you can ever get rid of the problem of poverty. Therefore, I cannot imagine how any person can base any approach on merely perpetuating the traditional structure.

If I have a 'medley of companions' in the Swatantra Party, I believe it is not only natural but also fair. Our nation is a medley. No one can deny this or ignore the fact. It is not a good thing that this big country and this large nation should be governed by anything that approaches the homogeneity of a clique. I take the reproach of the new Party being a medley as a compliment. It will not do for a nation or a country such as ours which will not fit into any framework built on the models of British political history to trust in the uncontaminated homogeneity of a ruling party.

Mr. Jawaharlal Nehru, I fear, tries to find out our stand from the prejudices he has developed in respect of the various personalities who have publicly associated themselves with the Swatantra Party and he has not cared to study the principles accepted by the Party as constituting its stand. Our 'stand' is not to be guessed by psycho-analysis but is to be seen in the principles we have agreed to and set out for public information with more clarity and precision and with greater brevity than

one can find in any of the Congress pronouncements or the Prime Minister's speeches. If this procedure were followed, it could be seen that the Swatantra Party is not intending either to 'perpetuate' anything or leave the big industrialists 'to do what they like'.

If the Prime Minister refers to our seeking to perpetuate spiritual values and preserve what is good in our culture and tradition, we plead 'guilty'. We object to the cultivation of bleak insecurity and uncertainty which has resulted from the present Government policies and forecasts. We object to the wasteful expansion of the size and authority of the hierarchy of officials over citizens and their occupations, which is the necessary result of what passes for socialism. We want a sense of stability for investment and individual effort. We want a strict adherence to the guarantees specified in the original Constitution which are so necessary for promoting enterprise and producing true wealth. The party stands for the higher production and expansion inherent in competitive private enterprise.

The Swatantra Party has not forgotten the need for adequate safeguards for the protection of labour and against unreasonable profits, prices and dividends where there is no competition, or where competition does not secure the necessary corrective. This surely is not 'leaving the big industrialists to do what they like'. On the other side, our party is opposed to leave the government 'to do what it likes'. We do not want the State to enter the field of trade and distribution in which officials are notoriously incompetent whether they attempt to carry on directly or, what is worse, through chosen favourites more experienced but less honest than themselves. Party advantage can never be forgotten by the ruling party which now feels the strength of the universal discontent. We are firmly opposed to the imposition of regulations and controls which must follow the faulty policy of Government trying to do what should be left to private enterprise and free competition. One fault brings in a train of other faulty steps to buttress the first wrong step.

The P. M. refers to what he calls the 'traditional system' to which he is opposed. We all understand the P. M's modernity. Phrases of that kind do not carry us far. What he considers as traditional and therefore out of date may be just what has proved itself as good. It is needless to point out that there is no virtue in replacing systems simply because they are 'traditional.' Survival is a proof of fitness, not of worthlessness. What is sought to be introduced, viz., State management in various forms has been found to be a dismal failure besides being oppressive and contrary to the spirit of democracy, and far too expensive for the taxpayers.

The main and most important point is the failure to realize the fundamental importance of agriculture beyond giving lip-service to it, and beyond making attempts to redistribute ownership. Neither redistribution of ownership nor thoughtless tinkering with the various forms of tenure prevailing in the various regions of our country, will add a single iota to the production of the soil. Indeed as has been observed by good authority, all the evidence points in the other direction. Ambitious and showy schemes of State-owned industries are not going to help us in the greater production of food-grains.

The Congress policies are not going to get rid of the problem of poverty. Plans to furnish employment on a widespread basis are more important than concentrated show places of immense size. Our resources are limited. The capacity to borrow and beg, whose success is essentially political, is not a true or lasting resource. The exploiting of political situation, by way of extensive borrowing, mortages our future, both financial and political. What we can get by way of taxes and public loans should be husbanded with greater foresight and skill than is now being done.

Colossal waste characterizes irrational plans such as nuclear power enterprises which have been found to be too costly even for nations much better placed than ourselves. All these errors

flow from the fundamental unwisdom of trying to be 'modern' where we cannot afford to be. Nothing can equal this stupendous folly and snobbery of turning to the Atom for industrial energy in India at this stage of scientific progress. If the Swatantra Party cannot be comprehended by Mr. Jawaharlal Nehru, it is due to causes resting in him and not in the party.

Mr. Charan Singh, who was responsible for introducing many far-reaching agrarian reforms in Uttar Pradesh and who resigned his office in the Cabinet of that State preferring it to surrendering his convictions about the futility of the Nagpur resolution, has written a book on the subject of the Government's plan to increase food production through joint farming. Mr. Charan Singh, like Professor Ranga, was born in a peasant's family. At least the preface of his book must be read by those who from Delhi, in the seats of power, seek to change the life of our peasantry.

Lastly, not average income, but average character lies at the root of all success and all failure of plans in this country. Nothing is being done for this but everything that is being done saps this fundamental asset. In addition to the exaltation of Mammon, class hatred is preached and explained as inherent in the Congress programme and vigorously defended by the Prime Minister and the Congress President. The Swatantra Party is not ashamed to adopt a creed of harmony and a sense of moral obligation and for this purpose to stress the true tradition of the land. What we get out of this, however small, is of the highest value. What we get out of conflict and compulsion, for which the Congress now stands, however large seemingly, is impermanent and worthless.

October 10, 1959 *Swarajya*

BANDARANAIKE

THE assassination of the Ceylon Prime Minister has caused people to reflect how this had come to happen. There is a lesson to be learnt from every misfortune or calamity. Several members in the Upper House of the Ceylon Parliament see the forces of extremist nationalism and obscurantism (which helped the late Prime Minister to power in 1956) in his assassination now. That is to say, if one uses certain extremist elements as a cheap means to get into power, those same elements will see backsliding in the wisdom and moderation that one has to show in action, and extremism then easily becomes frustration and anger against its previous hero.

Means are not ends but the choice of means and the expectations we raise among supporters offer dangerous temptation to the unwary public worker who is in a hurry to succeed. Too much care cannot be taken in choosing one's arguments or one's supporters. There is undoubted martyrdom in risking popularity for the sake of a wise policy of moderation, even if it should displease supporters who placed one in power and who expect all sorts of folly to be gratefully done for their sake.

Martyrdom apart, poor Bandaranaike has become a warning to public workers all over the under-developed world, not to give way to the temptation of using extremists to get into positions of power. One will often have to pay with one's life for afterwards reverting to wisdom. And nothing is gained even then for the nation.

Wisdom and moderation are the most difficult things in democratic governance. Extremism is as easy as sin but as ruinous also. It is easy to secure popularity by offering distribution before production. But when this is found impossible

you find it difficult to revert to wisdom, that is to ask for production before distribution. You then vainly seek easy solutions for production which may not involve a reversal of the original promises of paradise. Error leads to error and therefore the first step is ever most important.

October 10, 1959 *Swarajya*

THE CONSERVATIVE VICTORY IN BRITAIN

It is clear that the vast majority of the British people, which includes some of the most thinking souls in the world, do not have the prejudice that our own Prime Minister proclaimed against 'conservative' parties. The people of Britain have voted for the Conservative Party with a redoubled majority and thereby expressed their faith that a conservative party can succeed and take their people to prosperity even in the modern age. It is only those who do not *wish* to see that can fail to realize that if conservation is a good and permissible principle for industrialized Britain, it is more than essential for rural India. To conserve is not to oppose but to safeguard progress against gamblers for power. It is true that a sense of satisfaction with the MacMillan administration is responsible for the Conservative victory and not a want of faith in the utility of socialism which is the Labour Party's slogan. But what has caused that sense of satisfaction? How was it brought about, unless because the Conservative outlook was one that could and did secure prosperity, and because nationalization was not good for that purpose?

Socialism is a mystery-word. It does not mean, as our Prime Minister has been frank enough to admit, distribution of present wealth among the poor on an egalitarian or near-egalitarian basis. That, as he put it himself, would amount only to distribution of poverty. We must *produce* wealth as rapidly as pos-

sible. Can that be done by a policy of increasing State management or by increasing incentives for private enterprise in all fields outside the well-understood line of industries and operations which require State capital, and its corollary, State management? The Congress Party is pledged to the former, to State monopolies and State regulations of life and occupation—if there be any serious meaning in the 'socialism' resolution. The Swatantra Party places its faith in the latter. The beginning of State intervention may be small but 'socialism' binds the State to increasing State-monopolies and widespread nets of control.

It is curious that our Finance Minister takes a lot of trouble to explain away socialism when American questioners ask him about the Congress Party's policy. It appears almost as if socialism means one thing at Avadi and Nagpur and quite another in countries where we go to beg for help. If the interpretation given to Congress policy when speaking in the United States were correct, what should have been put down as the key word in the Congress resolutions is 'welfare' and not 'socialism', and the present mess would have been administrative and not political. Taxes on the wealthy who are very few in number have given but poor results. To pay for the megalomania of the past and to feed the coming 'big' enterprises, e.g., nuclear power stations, the ruling party has to resort to indirect taxes which the large poor population must be made to bear. It is number that counts and the number of the poor in India is large.

It may be argued that Mr. MacMillan's foreign policy success swung the vote to his side. But it was well known to British voters that the foreign policy of the British Socialist Party was not in any material sense different from that of the Conservative Party's when once Mr. Bevan and Mr. Gaitskell made it up between themselves. The fact is that the commonsense of the people of England trusts the Conservatives. Let it be remembered that large masses of working people voted for the 'Conservative' candidates all over Britain and not only people with 'vested interests.'

We require an atmosphere free from bribery, free from the lavish use of money secured from those who control funds through the power which State regulation of trade, industry and commerce gives to the party in power. It is unfortunate that the climate in India is in this respect far from healthy. Each electoral year is worse than the previous one and irregularity is getting to be conventionalized. Large sums have been admittedly secured by the Congress Party from industrialists and their guilty conscience apprehends that the new party is being supported by the rich which cannot happen under present conditions. These rich and unfortunate people living in a state of unbroken fear of the ruling party and all its myrmidons do not realize that they cannot get rid of oppression, unless they shed their fear and publicly stake on freedom rather than on favour.

October 17, 1959 *Swarajya*

GANDHIJI TALKS TO SOCIALISTS

A timely little book * as full of wisdom as an egg is full of meat has been brought out by the Navjivan Trust. Mahatma Gandhi was put under great pressure by his admiring socialist friends for over fifteen years to adopt socialism in place of the Congress policy. He successfully resisted this to the last and steered the Congress clear of socialism. His answer to the challenge was the doctrine of trusteeship of wealth, small and big. He based it on the first verse of the *Isa* Upanishad which was his total slogan of life in all aspects.

"When reforms lose faith in the method of persuasion," he said, "the technique of what is known as scientific socialism is

* *My Socialism.* By M. K. Gandhi, compiled by R. K. Prabhu, Navjivan Publishing House, Ahmedabad.

born. I am engaged in solving the same problems that face scientific socialists. My approach however is always and only through unadulterated non-violence."

"I do not like the assumptions underlying many of the propositions in the socialists' programme which go to show there is necessarily antagonism between the classes and the masses, or between the labourers and the capitalists, such that they can never work for mutual good. My own experience covering a fairly long period is to the contrary," he said in answer to the socialists' questionnaire in 1934. This is all so different from the recent statements of the Prime Minister and his daughter, the President of the Congress.

"If you have only State production, men will become moral and intellectual paupers. They will forget their responsibilities. I would therefore allow the capitalist and the zemindar to keep their factory and their land, but I would make them consider themselves trustees of their property. The socialists and the communists believe in generating and accentuating hatred to bring about economic equality."

Gandhiji wanted a moral revolution in men's minds that could change the nature of all wealth and meet the twin challenges of poverty, on the one hand, and centralization of all power in the State and the moral and intellectual pauperism this leads to.

"As soon as a man looks upon himself as a servant of society and earns for its sake and spends for its benefit, then purity enters into his earnings and there is *ahimsa* in his ventures. If men's minds turn towards this way of life, there will come about a peaceful revolution in society and that without bitterness. It may be asked whether history, at any time, records such a change in human nature. Such changes have certainly taken place in individuals. One may not perhaps be able to point to them in a whole society. But this only means that up till now there has never been an experiment on a large scale in non-violence. To

convince people of the truth that *ahimsa* is definitely an attribute of society is at once my effort and my experiment. In this age of wonders no one will say that a thing or idea is worthless because it is new."

Here is not reaction but revolution. In all humility one can claim on behalf of the Swatantra Party, that its aim is to bring about this revolution that Gandhiji adumbrated for Indian society. The Swatantra Party's aim is great, certainly not 'reactionary'.

> "The violence of private ownership is less injurious than the violence of the State. My theory of trusteeship is no make-shift, certainly no camouflage. I am confident that it will survive all other theories. It has the sanction of philosophy and religion behind it. No other theory is compatible with non-violence."
>
> —*Harijan* (1939)

Dharma is not to be confused with the fanaticism of some followers of Hinduism. *Dharma* is the widespread inner call among people of all classes in India to reduce their wants and to give away their possessions for the good of others. That this has been the tradition in our country for ages and can still be relied on as a living force can be seen, if only we look round wherever we go from Cape Comorin to Rishikesh and see the charitable foundations still intact in varying stages of maintenance everywhere. Whatever misfortune has attended them in the long course of history is traceable to the neglect of the State. There are no families in India that have held fast to their wealth through more than one or two generations without taking pride in the good works they have founded. On the other hand, attempts at violent distribution must end in State dictatorship and loss of individual incentive which is at the root of all production and national prosperity.

October 24, 1959 *Swarajya*

USE OF CONTRACEPTIVES

You may appoint a separate minister and open a large, new department for reducing population in order to make it meet the curve of food production. But the idea that the distribution of contraceptives will solve the problem is stupid. It is good to save sick mothers from further child-bearing, but no amount of money allotted and spent on forcing the sale of contraceptives, and no number of new jobs will reduce the population. The problem of integrating the production of food with the population increase cannot be tackled from the population end. It is folly to imagine that the natural growth of families, numbering over eight crores, can be controlled by the distribution of a few thousand contraceptives largely bought by those who are well off and who desire more luxuries and greater licence. We shall be spreading, sure enough, immorality among the lower age-groups. But we shall not be able that way to touch the population problem. There is an inevitable law of nature, the law of graduality, in this as in other matters. We shall not suddenly face an increased population with totally inadequate food supply. It is impossible that things can so happen. Long before the population has increased to that critical point the food situation itself will have affected the increase of population.

It is an unwise gardener who exercises all his skill and resources to keep the rotten trees growing but cuts down his nursery and throws away good seed because some mathematician has told him that he would be planting too thick. God knows what there is for us in the distant future. We may have to sacrifice half our population at one stroke in some non-violent, or even violent resistance. Let us not kill our future generation in advance.

October 24, 1959 *Swarajya*

INDIAN PHILOSOPHY AND THE MODERN WORLD

SCHOLARS and educated men throughout the world have come to realize that religions and philosophies say the same things all the world over, and that there is little to be marked out as distinct and different. All philosophies and all religions tell their followers to be good, and enforce that advice by adding that to be good is the highest wisdom as well as duty. There is no difference as to what it is to be good. Prophets and teachers have no differences among them on this. Abstruse analysis only seems to confuse what is quite clear to the conscience of men and women. There are some differences in laying stress due to the conditions of the place and the time, but allowing for this the fundamental unity of all philosophies and religions is more than clearly established.

Indian philosophy is based on the acceptance of the Deity. It, therefore, makes large room for grace, and for 'surrender', the essential preliminary to grace. Man has little hope without dependence on divine grace. In Indian philosophy, as in other systems of religious thought, it is accepted that divine grace is the ultimate consolation of man. The main stress in Indian philosophy is, however, on the doctrine of *karma*, the inescapable law of cause and effect in things spiritual as in the material world. Every act has its effect on oneself, whether the act be thought, word, or deed. *Karma* is not fatalism. It is law. The doctrine of *karma* does not underestimate human effort. It puts, indeed, the highest value on it by ensuring the proper result for every act. Every act, good or bad, has at once an effect on oneself apart from its effect on others. This is the Indian doctrine of *karma*, for which the religious philosophy of Hinduism is justly famous. It is well that the modern world should realize the impossibility of man's escape from the

result of his own actions. The warning that the law of *karma* gives to us, to beware at every step, will serve the world as no other teaching can in this age of science.

There is another great, perhaps in a way even greater, service that Hindu philosophy has done and is doing to the modern world. It is in its doctrine of positive tolerance. 'Tolerance' is not an adequate word, even with the addition of the adjective 'positive,' fully to express this most important tenet of Indian thought—that there are several ways to reach God, and that several forms of worship are equally acceptable to the Supreme Being. Indian philosophy lays the greatest stress on an attitude not merely of passive tolerance but active respect for different forms of worship. It is the exact opposite of the doctrine of exclusive truth on which Christianity and Islam sincerely and seriously insist. The earliest sacred teachings in Hinduism laid emphasis on the doctrine of positive respect for differing forms of worship and its corollary of positive companionship with different types of worshippers. It may appear strange, but it is a fact that Indian philosophy seeks to look upon even the unbeliever's denial as a form of worship, for to be constantly concerned with God's presence is the obverse of the very denial in which the atheist indulges, provided his conduct and life do not offend the eternal laws of right behaviour.

A third element in Indian ethics that deserves mention for appreciation in the modern world is the doctrine of trusteeship, as it has been called, since Gandhiji gave that name to it. Whatever you hold as your own, look upon it as given by God to you and look upon yourself as entrusted with it only for good uses. This is the reconciliation between the charter of individual property and the claim of society. The claim of society to the benefit of all that its members hold cannot be denied. But the pull to do away with 'property', and the rights appertaining to it, will kill the incentive to produce and safeguard it against waste. So it is that Gandhiji pointed out what he called

the doctrine of trusteeship as the answer to, not a justification for, modern socialism. He preferred the ancient socialism of Hindu doctrine to the modern compulsory form of expropriation, because he believed it would keep the 'goose' alive while taking the eggs.

The fourth element in Indian religious philosophy that I would point out may look like a defence of polytheism and of savage forms of worship. It is the safeguard that Hinduism offer against anthropomorphism in religion. The polytheism, that is, the worship of the single Supreme Being in many forms, and the number and diversity and strangeness of the forms to be approached with reverence in the spirit of worship—these serve to provide against anthropomorphism better than the concentration on a single form, more or less indistinctly conceived in the devotee's mind as the exclusive object of worship and the only real Supreme Being. Nothing can be a more scientific approach in the quest to grasp partially what is beyond human grasp. The polymorphism of God in Hindu philosophy is not a historic synthesis of varying beliefs but service in the direction of correct thought in this field.

Another point worthy of mention in this brief survey is the elevation of disinterested work to the rank of worship in the Hindu scriptures. The way of life taught in the *Bhagavad Gita* is based expressly on the equal dignity and sacredness of every form of labour that falls to one's lot. All work, it reiterates with solemn emphasis, should be done honestly and disinterestedly for *loka sangraha*—welfare of the community—and not for the satisfaction of personal desires. The performance of one's allotted task in this spirit is specifically described in the *Gita* as an authorized and accepted form of worship in place of every ritual. Indeed, the *Gita* lays down in a unique manner the whole socialist doctrine by characterizing work as a religious offering in the truest sense.

These elements I have touched upon may serve to point out the place of Indian philosophy in the modern world, which,

with all its advance in the field of physical science, has also come to realize the vastness of the unknown and the consequent place of religion in life.

October 27, 1959 *The Guardian*

EVILS OF WHOLE TIME POLITICS

One would welcome the efforts of the Congress to keep the communists off from dominating our politics, if the Congress stuck to its moorings. But when it followed the fatal tactics of adopting the policies of the communists, and competing with them on their own ground, the Congress lost its case. Its claim to the homage of the people can no longer be deemed valid.

The socialism of the Congress has just begun to unfold itself and the beginning is bad enough. The people have good reason to feel, as they might, if the country was under the occupation of an enemy force. "They are bewildered and oppressed by a sense of uncertainty and insecurity, unable to think of anything except present safety." Wherever we turn we see dread of those in authority and about what may happen to their business if they dare do something they would like to do. It is a sad irony that Swaraj should result in this general atmosphere of fear.

Newspaper readers and voters are expected to feel elated when the ruling party lavishly, and in some cases thoughtlessly, spends money in selected pockets of development. It is easy enough to do this, for the money comes from the national till. The people in these pockets imagine that it is a gift from the local Congress bosses and as peculiar benefits resulting from Congress policy. When it is published that so many thousand crores are to be spent during the next five years, voters are

expected to go into raptures. But everyone knows that these huge figures represent not only planned expenditure, but also the amount of revenue planned to be raised, that is, taxes to be levied, over and above the levies already made, and over and above the huge borrowings from abroad which have to be repaid with interest added, which too means fresh taxation. There are two sides to every grandiose plan : the tax side is what the people have to study, the Planning Commission studies the other side. Some others still must study the ratio of administrative inefficiency and leakage that will eat into these figures.

The mantra of self-employment given by Acharya Ranga is what the Indian word *swatantra* expresses. Self-employment is the nearest English rendering of the goal of *swatantra*. Swatantra life is a self-employed life free from the interference of ignorant officialdom.

Ludwig Erhard writes in his book on the accomplished miracle of German recovery : "The undisputed success of the (free economy) policy demonstrates how much more sensible it is to concentrate all available energies on increasing the nation's wealth rather than to squabble over the distribution of this wealth and thus be side-tracked from the fruitful path of increasing the national income. It is considerably easier to allow everyone a larger slice out of a bigger cake than to gain anything by discussing the division of a smaller cake."

There is another and a rather comic aspect of self-employment. One wishes we had self-employed politicians ruling our country's fate in Parliament and legislative assemblies instead of a crowd of 'whole time' politicians let loose on the people and on the district officers to the detriment of their efficiency and impartiality. Politics has become an employment of persons who find it a more profitable business than anything they can devise for themselves based on their talent and training. An old report of Mr. Sadiq, on behalf of what was called a demo-

cratic front inside the Congress dated 1950, throws a flood of confirming light on this charge. Controls and regulations open up a big market for politicians to secure monopolies for their chosen beneficiaries. Acharya Ranga's slogan of self-employed peasants can be supplemented by a slogan for self-employed politicians. Half the grievances of the people would vanish if this could be got into being. A sample research into the history of the personal affairs of some Congress Party bosses would throw much light on the true causes of the changed attitude of people all over the country towards congressmen and demonstrate the need for politicians that are self-employed and do not depend for their own private budgets on government controls and licences and their power to influence the course of the administration.

October 31, 1959 *Swarajya*

INDIA AND THE TIBET DEBATE

WITH considerable unwillingness I issued my statement expressing my disapproval of the attitude taken by the delegate for India at the U.N. over the Tibet resolution. I feel a most unfortunate situation has been created by it. As I have stated, it amounts in effect to telling the Dalai Lama that we should be glad if he went away from India. This would be *adharma*, bad politics, and totally opposed to the feelings of all good people in India.

Dharma is often subtle (*sookshma*), as Bhishma said. The *Mahabharata* and *Ramayana* contain a number of lessons on this point. It is easy to grasp a general principle of right conduct but often one can go wrong in the application of it. If *dharma* had been rigidly applied, Vali would have triumphed and Sugriva liquidated. Duryodhana would have vanquished Bhima and wickedness would have triumphed. Balarama committed

just this mistake which our delegate at the U.N. has committed. He maintained that Sri Krishna ought not to help the Pandavas because the violence of war was always bad and he non-co-operated during the Kurukshetra battle. Arjuna too argued for the same position with his great Charioteer and Lawgiver.

These references to classic precedents are not made by me for boosting traditional values, or in mere fulfilment of my urge to press to attention the teachings of our ancients, but I do it to explain the difficulty that presents itself in the practice of admittedly good policy and the need for wise discrimination. The difficulty has been recognized from the earliest times, and if we do not discriminate but rigidly carry out the letter, the spirit and substance of a good principle would stand destroyed. The abrogation of the opportunity which a U.N. debate would furnish to discuss China's conduct in Tibet amounts not to non-alignment but to passive abetment. India had the great chance of sterilizing the debate of its cold war character and making a contribution to the world movement for justice and human rights.

That it is wrong to keep China out of the U.N. is common ground. Indeed, the Tibet debate would have given India an additional opportunity to emphasize her condemnation of this attitude of keeping real China out of a world organization. The weakness of an *ex parte* U.N. debate would have itself convincingly demonstrated the error. As the Malayan delegate pointed out, " the fact that People's China was not represented did not constitute a justifiable ground for the Assembly to turn a blind eye to what had taken place ". On the contrary, Tibet's complaint could be gone into and an additional point made out of the situation for pressing the inclusion of China in the U.N.

India's action on this occasion, I fear, is very bad politics. It can yet be corrected by India taking part in the debate, if there be time for it at some stage. No man can serve two masters. The one and only safe master is *dharma,* be it in poli-

tics or household affairs, *dharma* with the required discrimination for right application of principles to action.

(Since the above was in print, it is reported that the Indian delegate took some part in the debate and retrieved the position to some extent. —C.R.)

October 31, 1959 *Swarajya*

CONGRESS SOCIALISM AND WELFARE

The large farm yields more than the small field. Large capital yields more than small investment. These are admitted but Congress 'socialism' cannot tolerate privately owned large farms or privately owned large capital, because these increase the gap between the poor and those few who are well off. So, they must belong to the State and be managed by its officials. If not belonging entirely to the State, they must be under its full control and indirect management. This is the State socialism to which the Congress has pledged itself. It may not be done all at once but that is the goal to which things must be steadily and speedily driven. The plan is to break up existing large farms and seek to form new large farms on a non-ownership basis. What, however, must be remembered is that ownership produces more out of a farm and out of capital than what someone is trying to produce for others, be it farm or industry. The State ought to prevent injustice and promote social welfare, but should not seek to expropriate and extinguish ownership, the spring of energy and the source of production. State management means expanding power of the official class, and waste, favouritism and inefficiency. Capital investment produces expanding employment; and employment is what we should seek to expand until it covers the whole population. If the State cuts into savings for

capital, to that extent unemployment is given a longer lease of life. This is the Swatantra Party's contention.

I am reminded that I opened temples to those who were previously untouchable, that I got an Act passed to wipe out peasants' debts, where they had paid by way of interest double the principal borrowed, that I got tenancy laws passed by which farm tenants and labourers got a much larger share of the produce than ever before in the Tanjore area, that I levied a tax for the first time on sales at the rate of half a naya paisa per rupee of transaction in order to meet the loss of drink revenue, that I removed rice controls overnight when I took office in Madras in 1952, and so on, and that these were revolutionary socialist measures; and therefore I contradict myself when I oppose the present socialist policies of the Congress. I am grateful for these arguments. My objection is not to a policy of welfare socialism but to the socialism now sought to be put into execution by the Congress. I object to the tinkering with ownership and the base of our agricultural structure. I object to a policy of spreading class hatred. The facts cited against me actually prove that I am not the reactionary or the partisan of the rich that now it is sought to dub me as, but that I am and was always a friend of the poor. If I teach a girl how to let a vessel down a well and draw water, it does not mean I should not object to her falling into the well and killing herself for a quarrel with her husband. If I teach a young man how to use the knife in surgery, does it disable me from telling him not to kill his patient by over-using his knife? I have no dislike for change or reform, but I dislike change for the mere sake of change, or for securing group votes sacrificing harmony and real welfare. I claim that what congressmen are now threatening or promising to do will not help but only serve to deceive the poor. They promise land to the landless but this is not going to be done. They promise to increase employment for the poor, but this is not going to be done. Government offices will be expanded but that is not going to help the poor but will only aggravate inflation. They wish to increase food production but what they do will reduce it.

Nature is kind but the policies of Government are depressing agriculture.

I am guilty of contradiction, it seems, because I helped the co-operation movement to make considerable progress when I presided over the affairs of Madras in 1952, whereas now I object to co-operative farming. I have explained and made it clear to those who are not unwilling to understand, that no one objects to co-operation but we maintain that multiple ownership and multiple management, with heavy subsidies from the general taxpayer, are not good for the cultivation of food-crops by our peasantry in their fields. Success with subsidies proves nothing. If at all, it demonstrates the opposite of what is sought to be established.

The President of the Congress in Madras State pays me all these compliments, while seeking to make out an *estoppel* against me to bar my objections to the present Congress policy. I have no objection to the State taking the eggs provided some eggs are left behind to keep the breed alive and provided the mother bird is not to be killed and eaten up. I desire as ardently as anyone else social justice and social welfare; but the socialism adopted at Avadi, and unfolded now, will not produce social welfare or justice but only yield a foul crop of hatred and conflict, and reduce national wealth. When we have the big cake one may tolerate the use of the violence of the State to make just distribution, but we are still to make the cake, when our national wealth is at a low point and our concern should be to raise it. Reduction of capital potential, that is, of individual savings and mopping up of all resources for spending, through State officials, will not serve to increase national wealth. Thoughts of equalizing have no meaning in the context. This is the opposition of the Swatantra Party to the policies of the Congress.

October 31, 1959 *Swarajya*

PROSPECT FOR NON-ALIGNMENT

It is becoming increasingly clear every day that we have before us, under present Congress policies, the prospect of heavy indirect taxation which will make the curve of living costs rise yet higher. In addition to taxation, more or less concealed by rising prices from the consumer's eye, there will alongside of it be big inflation caused by expenditure on reckless plans, unproductive floating of bonds for compensation payable for needless tinkering with land ownership and charged on the nation, and eleventh hour military expenditure. The consequences of Chinese aggression will not only be a diversion of attention from internal issues and the usual strengthening of the political position of the party in power—all external troubles true or alleged bring this about—but also an upsetting of the national budget which will be handed over bound hand and foot to the Defence Ministry. The jargon will be 'the emphasis has shifted'. Military policy in the face of an enemy on the frontier is the enemy of all planning. The almost contemptuous remarks of Mr. Stephen Barber reported from London in *The Indian Express* are an indication of what we shall have to face.

> *The News Chronicle's* Stephen Barber, who is at present in New Delhi, has cabled that India's Ministry of Defence is out shopping for helicopters and transport planes capable of flying at high altitudes. Planes are wanted urgently to ferry supplies to the Himalayan outposts on a frontier that Mr. Nehru's neutralist Government never expected to have to defend. 'We are looking for machines of this type in Britain, America and France,' Delhi's military spokesman told Mr. Barber. 'They are hard to find,' the spokesman added. According to Mr. Barber, all that the Indian Air Force has at the moment for the job is the handful of specially supercharged Dakotas. Two of these recently crashed in the impenetrable jungle of North-East Frontier Agency district

—now threatened by the Chinese—when attempting to parachute stores to border check-posts. This illustrates just one of the problems India's High Command is now grappling with. Permission has now been given, Mr. Barber understands, for rapid expansion of the Dogra and Ladakhi battalions. Simultaneously, the Assam Rifles—another name recalling Kipling's era—is being strengthened and put under army command in the north-east. These martial moves, Mr. Barber adds, don't mean that Mr. Nehru has abandoned hopes of reasoning with China. It is plain that India is in no shape today for a war—not even to defend herself—concludes Mr. Barber.

It is easy to preach to others the doctrine of no war; but it is difficult, if not morally impossible, to cope with intense national feeling and universal cries for action when any aggression takes place on one's own territory. The worst feature in such situations is that often, if not always, the nations involved in such aggressions more or less honestly believe (on either side) that the offence lies on the other side and that there is no alternative left but some kind of military action to restore what either side believes has been disturbed by aggression. There is no lack of material or protagonists on either side to convince their respective people that there is no way out but war. Vociferous sections of political thought in every country find no difficulty in posing national dignity as the greatest priority. Even Mr. Nehru will thus be driven to military conflict. And, thereafter, the god of war is not going to be guided in his pace or in his progress by logic. Once he is on the march he follows other laws than logic. Semantic distinctions between defence and offence will be of no avail once passions are up. Our Prime Minister has had to plead guilty to keeping the facts of Chinese aggression away from the public and from Parliament for a significantly long and inexcusable period. This gives his assailants a great advantage in the battle for policies.

The situation can be saved only by the admission of China in the U.N. and by taking up her aggression on Indian territory for enquiry in the U.N. If America refuses to budge on the

issue of Chinese admission, India will have no choice but to pocket her pride and shelve her doctrines of peace and to do what all other nations have done, however unwillingly. It may come—indeed one fears it must come—to seeking the help of nations whom till now we did not wish to approach for military help. Non-alignment which, speaking physically, was never a sturdy rope to balance oneself upon, whatever its spiritual justification, must now go to pieces if China obstinately continues to think and do as she has been doing, and Russia continues to hesitate to advise, or her advice is not heeded.

The great pity is that this breakdown of non-alignment must happen when we figure as a nation seeking help rather than when we could offer our moral support without asking for any favour for ourselves. It is a pity again that we have to turn westwards when the Western nations are in a comparatively cold mood and are probably more inclined to say 'I told you so' than to come forward with steps that would help India, but at the same time are likely to complicate their own position relative to Soviet Russia.

What I wrote in my letter to *The New York Times* is what continues to be of the highest importance now. I wrote that letter (reproduced below) on 11th September last but unfortunately on account of the preoccupations of the American people over Khrushchov's visit, the editor was sorry that it could be published only on 25th October.

> The folly of follies in the present international situation is the refusal of the United Nations to believe that China should be 'punished' by being refused admission. They think that admission would amount to condonation of her offences. This is not good sense but only anger.
>
> It is wrong to act as if the U.N. were only a cold war organization of the West. It is believed that the presence of Russia is a historical accident and that this error should not be aggravated by the deliberate addition of China.

it good to convert themselves into a different community and be cut off from the main stream of life in the country. It would be most reprehensible desertion, and it would be a very bad day for India, if the most enlightened among us leave their posts of public duty in the shepherding of the people and convert themselves into a separate caste. The enlightened may be expected to understand this. I believe, therefore, that this will not happen.

Apart from what will or will not happen, what would wisdom dictate ? Can we dispense with religion and hope to carry progress forward, or keep India in the map of the civilized world ? If our four hundred millions strike out religion from their lives, India will be wiped out.

In the highest sense, and from the point of view of truth, religion is an intensely individual issue. Every man and every woman must find the answer in his or her own heart. But there is a national question also. And a national question may be deemed to be always a question of high expediency, though not a question of conviction or conscience. We must hold together. And we cannot hold together only on the strength of police regulations. An internal regulator of conduct is absolutely necessary. Will men and women be good and wise without the aid of religion, i.e., without an attempt in their lives to practise the presence of God ? Have we become self-sufficient by reason of scientific knowledge and become capable of maintaining character without the sanctions and discipline of some religion or other ?

I do not believe it. I believe the truth is far from it. Enlightened concern for society's welfare and for humanity's welfare has not taken the place of religion and become a fixed quasi-religion as people had hoped in the nineteenth century. Far from this having happened, what do we see in the whole world ? We see the most advanced people preparing, for so-called defence, new weapons that (when used) will surely end in disastrous injury to humanity. Is any further demonstration

necessary to show that human welfare does not appear to appeal with any degree of force as a result of greater scientific knowledge? Whatever honesty or compassion or nobility remains in the world, it is due to other causes, not the advance of science.

Forgetting world politics and thinking in terms of our own people, the enemies of good character, of humanity, of equanimity, of tolerance and kindliness, of purity of thought and rectitude, are avarice, lust and anger. Modern life has not simplified but multiplied desires, and with that multiplication the greed and anger that are associated with those desires have assumed varied and intensified shapes.

As desires are multiplied without the corrective of a sense of spiritual values, without developing the inner ear for the voice of conscience, knowledge of modern science or technology does not reduce either greed or lust. Indeed, scientific and technological knowledge has nothing to do with these criminal disturbances of the mind. On the contrary, it finds fresh tools for evil and actually facilitates greater indulgence in all forms of greed, lust and anger.

The only thing that can prevent or restrain these evils is the religious sense. Out of reverence and awe for the Divine Power that rules the Universe, man developed a sense of spiritual values. This sense has taken the shape of civilization. It can be maintained in effective potent condition, so as to shape man's thought and action, only by religion, by the continuous practice in our lives of the presence of God.

It is true that a sense of shame, by itself, often prevents overt misconduct. But it does not go to the root of the mischief; it does not stop undesirable mental activities. Even as far as it goes in respect of overt conduct, shame necessarily depends on the state of public opinion. It is unfortunately a fact that, as individuals yield progressively to temptation, public

opinion also gets to be progressively lax, and the sense of shame, which is fear of public opinion, gradually disappears. Public opinion is, in the ultimate analysis, made up of individual character. The sum total cannot long resist the individual decrease. We are in a vicious circle, therefore, if we depend only on public opinion for a sanction. We have seen the progress of corruption in elections and in the administrative departments. We have observed how public opinion is worn out, so to say, by the perseverance of crime.

If we are sure that character is essential for all civic and national progress and stability, then we must nurse and maintain what has been the most effective instrument for the purpose among all nations and during all periods of history. And this, any historian will tell us, is religion. It is religion that fortified men against temptation and gave them courage to live and work and die for good causes. We can see this in the social and economic history of all the peoples of the world. All civilization is rooted in religion.

Whatever the form or the denomination or the creed which birth and family provide for the individual, it is religion that fixes good and sound habits of thought and of external activity. Sometimes this works unseen and misleads men to believe that religion could be dispensed with. It would be wrong to ignore the silent forces of life, often the strongest, stronger than the forces that proclaim themselves loudly. Our forefathers and the forefathers of all the great nations of the world drew strength from the contemplation and worship of the Supreme Being. That worship and the faith behind it were the source of power to withstand false desires and base passions and to maintain high ideals of conduct in peace and in war. All history proves this. Neither science by itself, nor moral teachings that merely ask for good conduct without furnishing a sanction for it, can achieve the purpose. Mere morality may run for some time on a previously acquired religious momentum. When the momentum is spent, it will stop dead. Moral teachings that are

associated with a divinely inspired personality are religion and stand on a different footing from mere maxims printed as school literature.

In the administrative services, on the bench, at the bar, in the medical profession, in industry and commerce, in the legislature, indeed in all walks of life, we require truly religious men. Otherwise, there is no future for India. " Morals cannot stand on their own feet, but must be based on religion. We cannot make new religions in cold blood but must stick to traditional religions, clearing out non-essential accretions." This is Prof. Toynbee's opinion.

In a recent book the preface to which was written in December 1955, Prof. Toynbee deals at some length with accretions in religions. "If it is hazardous," he says, "to state the essence of the higher religions, it is even more hazardous to try to discriminate from it the non-essential accretions that can be and ought to be discarded. It is perhaps safest to begin by stripping off what looks like the outermost layer, and then to feel our way cautiously, through one layer after another, towards the quick." Dealing with the myths, that form part of all religions, "Can these myths be discarded," he asks, "without taking the heart out of the faiths whose essence the myths convey?"

The universe is a mystery, and the key to this mystery is hidden. Even the great iconoclast Bernard Shaw wrote : "All the sweetness of religion is conveyed to the world by the hands of story-tellers and image-makers. Without their fiction the truths of religion would for the multitude be neither intelligible nor even apprehensible; and the prophets would prophesy and the teachers teach in vain. Myths are an indispensable means for expressing as much as we can express of the ineffable for probing what is beyond man's intellectual horizon."

The process of discarding what may be considered unessential is a hazardous operation. Toynbee graphically describes

the risk : "You might go on peeling an onion till you found that you had peeled away the heart as well as the skin; and you might go on cleaning a picture—stripping off successive coats of varnish and layers of paint—till, with a shock, you found yourself left with nothing but the bare canvas backing."

We have a multiplicity of religions in India. The largeness of the population and the tolerance practised by successive rulers have left this result. We cannot make a new single synthetic religion in cold blood for everybody. If we discouraged any of the religions in which large sections of our people are born, we would be weakening and destroying what we cannot replace. We were taught by Mahatma Gandhi that all religions are equally worthy of reverence. This was not an invention of his for political ends. He based this on commonsense and truth and on irrefutable religious texts of the highest authority among Hindus. It is impossible that the India of Gandhiji can dispense with religion.

Science has not enabled us, and it cannot enable us, to carry on without religion. On the contrary, the advance of science and technology makes religion more necessary. Material progress without religion would be dangerous even if it were possible. And if India's government is to be an institution integrated with her people's lives, if it is to be a true democracy and not a super-imposed Western institution staged in Indian dress, religion must have an important and recognized place in it, with impartiality and equal reverence for all the creeds and denominations prevailing in India. This alone would be historically consistent with the peaceful revolution brought about by Mahatma Gandhi.

November 2, 1959 *Bhavan's Journal*

ONAGOW

THE progress of the disarmament proposal, with accord from both the East and West to a resolution in the General Assembly of the United Nations to join in sponsoring it, should under normal conditions make us all shout with joy. But what is happening round about us is spoiling the weather for confidence or congratulation.

In spite of the hopeful atmosphere in the international horizon that has dawned just now, we must be prepared for every eventuality and keep our policy seaworthy.

It appears the time has come for the governments and nations of the world not aligned with the East or West, to enter into a positive union and take the responsibility not for defence or offence, but for the elimination of all nuclear, bacteriological and chemical weapons that threaten human civilization, and will throw mankind back to savage status. An Organization of the Non-Aligned Governments of the World (ONAGOW, as it may be called) may now be a union of small, unimportant and poor nations as compared with NATO or the U.S.S.R.; but it will represent a force of higher spiritual authority than either of the other two cold war blocs. India can, and is morally bound to, take a lead in forming this passive world force against the present balance of terror, and against all the new barbarities invented in this century, which threaten to envelop civilization and even now have undermined international law. The non-aligned governments of the world must do more than mere 'red cross' work, when some nations of the world who, having repudiated peace, still in their own interests call for such services lest they ruin themselves. The neutral governments should cast aside the impotent role of serviceable mediators to be called in only when belligerent

governments find it convenient to accept their services. They must unite and generate an independent, moral force, and fight for peace and civilization with as much vigour as the Powers who have ranged themselves in two opposing armed blocs and are every day preparing to destroy each other, and along with it the world and its civilization. These non-aligned nations have an immediate duty of resisting the trespass on the neutral world and the misuse of 'trust' territories by the nuclear Powers with test explosions and inter-continental missiles. ONAGOW will have the great and uniterrupted work of opposing and neutralizing the cold war itself. There is no lack of moral or intellectual power in the non-aligned nations, if only they throw off the hypnotic spell that the cold war belligerents, with their achievements in the field of physics, have cast on them. Physics is not everything. The spirit is stronger than all physics.

Coming to India in particular, if our financial obligations to the West or East make our Government hesitate to take any such step, or if such considerations tend to warp our judgment, then indeed the strings attached to these transactions have begun to work. It would be a warning to us that we must resist the implications in time and break those strings before they grow stronger by prescription. Later the strings will become too real to be ever cut asunder. If we must challenge the crisis, let us do it in time and not put it off until it hardens against us and becomes impossible of being grappled with. Let us remind ourselves that freedom is too precious to be lost for calculations of prosperity, or even for the certainty of it. Let us be poor people, and humble in our way of life if it be necessary, but let not our non-alignment deteriorate under the pressure of these loans into a double dependence, a two-fold satellitism, a worse state than being a satellite only to one side. Our non-alignment would then indeed be a status of total insignificance. Our fate would then be certain that one side or the other will some day claim whole-hog homage by dint of relative superior strength. Bandung, thanks to China, has lost vitality. We must bring into being a peace force of non-aligned governments which will have

the mass backing of their respective nations and not be a mere diplomatic machine working behind office doors.

November 7, 1959 *Swarajya*

MISINTERPRETING GANDHIJI

SPEAKING on "Socialism in India" at the Harold Laski Institute of Political Science, Ahmedabad, Mr. Morarji Desai said that "Gandhiji was one of the greatest socialists" and that he "advocated the noblest principles of socialism from the early days of his political career." The Finance Minister claimed, further, that Gandhiji's philosophy of purity of means was the basis of the socialism which the Congress Party endeavoured to usher in. This attempt to trace back the socialism of Mr. Nehru to inspiration from Gandhiji's teaching is factually unsustainable, and not only does it distort and misrepresent his political philosophy, it violates inexcusably one of the basic principles of purity of means, truth, to which the Mahatma attached so much value. The Christians claimed the Mahatma as a true Christian, though he was not a votary of doctrinaire proselytizing Christianity. Mr. Morarji Desai's thesis describing the Mahatma as the spiritual father of our present-day Congress socialism is as convincing, or as honest, as the endeavour of a Christian missionary to convert Hindus into Christians by citing the Mahatma as authority.

Long-range objectives of social benefit are common to all political organizations that seek popular suffrage, just as a certain moral outlook is common to all religions. The socialist objectives are commonly defined as the abolition of poverty, the creation of a social service State, a greater equalization of wealth and economic planning for full employment and stability. To

subscribe to these objectives is not the same thing as achieving them, nor does it make one a socialist, as even conservatives and non-socialists may recognize them as worthwhile and inscribe them on their banners. What distinguishes socialism from other doctrines is the place given to compulsion to bring about benefit to people. Socialism is based on the theory that men are *not* by nature good, and so they must be compelled by external law. Only believers in this theory can be classed as socialists for the purpose of differentiation from non-socialists or anti-socialists. In this sense the Mahatma was never a socialist.

On the contrary, he successfully resisted socialism and to the last breath of his life he foiled Mr. Nehru's attempt to replace Congress policy with his pet socialist experiments. This is clear from the following statements of the Mahatma already familiar to readers of *Swarajya.*

> When reformers lose faith in the method of persuasion, the technique of what is known as scientific socialism is born.

> I do not like the assumptions underlying many of the propositions of the socialists' programme which go to show there is necessarily antagonism between the classes and the masses or between the labourers and the capitalists such that they can never work for mutual good.

> If you have only State production, men will become moral and intellectual paupers.

> The socialists and the communists believe in generating and accentuating hatred to bring about economic equality.

> The violence of private ownership is less injurious than the violence of the State. My theory of trusteeship is no makeshift, certainly no camouflage. I am confident that it will survive all other theories.

In the face of these unequivocal Gandhian denunciations of the characteristic credo and technique of socialism, it is daring

on the part of a Minister of the Government of India to claim the moral authority of the Mahatma for the present socialistic policies of the Congress. Mr. Nehru was powerless to inflict his socialism on the country so long as the Mahatma was alive. It was only after Gandhiji's death that Mr. Nehru could turn the Congress to his view. The most charitable interpretation that can be placed on Mr. Morarji's attribution of Gandhian inspiration to Congress socialist policies is that it is due to ignorance and not to deliberate intention.

November 14, 1959 *Swarajya*

SOCIALISM UNDEFINED

In a speech of the usual length and comprehensive character on Nov. 11, at Dewas, after dealing with China and announcing his praiseworthy resolves that our territories shall be defended without external assistance or alliance, and after condemning the communists of India and all communal parties, Hindu, Muslim and others, Mr. Jawaharlal Nehru touched on socialism and expressed his adherence thereto. He qualified his socialism as 'socialism without compulsion' and gave no further description of it in its positive aspects. So far as the poor people of India are concerned this is probably enough to make them believe, for the time being, that without compulsion they will be made rich and happy by the mantra of socialism. But as for thinking men who wish to know more about it, it is socialism without definition. We have to understand it only by what is being attempted by the present ruling party to be done under that name.

So far, it has been heavy taxation, large borrowings, talk about co-operative farming, and State interference in trade with permits and favours to particular traders in important lines of general consumption. There is of course some transport service run by the State, the management of a few big industrial con-

cerns with State capital, and the famous L.I.C. These indications and experiments are enough to show that the poor will not benefit by the socialism that has become the creed of the Congress and therefore of the Government. The recent admissions of the Prime Minister as to Rs. 900 crores sunk in agriculture with no results proportionate to the money put in it, and the unpreparedness for State trading in grains which, therefore, must quietly be given up, are enough to demonstrate the intrinsic mischief in officials taking up (on behalf of Government) such work as they were never trained for and are never going to be trained for. Co-operative societies absorbing a small (if not wholly insignificant) fraction of those engaged in any particular productive or distributing activity, upon which the Government must pour financial help from the general exchequer, do not prove that such societies would normally produce or do business better than the individual doing it in his own interest. Society is served well where the individual engaged in his own individual interest and aspiration serves society also. Forgetting this and assuming that mathematics can be worked without taking human nature into account, the socialists seek to rearrange things in a big continent and make matters worse than they were. The general welfare is not going to be served by the socialist dogma which means that the State owns everything and the citizens are only wage-earners.

To talk about co-operative farming is easy, but in practice it must lead to compulsory collective farming under State direction. Physical compulsion can be substituted by the temptation of funds given out of the public till, to be spent in certain favoured pockets. It is easy to grant subsidies and cheap loans out of the treasury and tempt into existence 'voluntary' co-operative societies; but it is a false and expensive way of seeking to prove a dogma. Weighted scales cannot measure out truth. Such experiments are of no value.

Socialism can mean nothing if there is not State compulsion attached to it. It resolves itself then into mere claptrap. The

country is not in a position, the problems are too serious for us, to let politicians get away with claptrap. The question must be asked : " How will you find wealth enough to distribute among the poor through the socialism you talk about? Have you not admitted that even if all the wealth of all the rich is confiscated, not minding the ruining of industries that would be involved in it, you will not find enough to go round? You will distribute poverty, not wealth." If then the problem is production of wealth and not its present distribution, what is the best way of producing wealth? Does not experience show that management by paid officials of the State is a complete failure? Is not owner-management and fair competition the best means of production? Has this not been demonstrated in all countries where compulsion is not used? If all this be admitted the talk about socialism must not be allowed to deceive anyone. This claptrap must be given up and an earnest effort made to utilise experience, capital and personal interest to produce more wealth and give employment on fair terms to an increasing number of people, and thereby help the raising of the general standard of life. The promise to make poor people rich by means of socialism is deception.

The Swatantra Party objects to such deception. It does not object to the poor becoming richer. It objects to plans that favour selected and favoured groups for the sake of votes. Socialist plans and expenditure cause prices to rise and increase the cost of administration and add to the army of officials, who find their sport in teasing citizens. The poor can be helped only by greater and wider employment, and this can be done only by the expansion of private industry and private enterprise all over the country. By crippling investment potentiality socialist taxation prevents this.

In a poor country like ours, there is greater need for the fostering of private enterprise and individual initiative, and for avoiding what cripples all this, than even in a country like England which has rejected its Socialist Party, by a large vote.

Socialism is not an end but a means and its worth as a means has been weighed and found wanting.

November 21, 1959 *Swarajya*

PEACE AT ANY PRICE

WISHFUL thinkers report from the U.S.A. that Mr. Eisenhower is expected to assure Mr. Nehru, when he meets him in New Delhi, of America's moral support in India's dispute with China. The most effective support that America can give to India, which is not of the character of military aid, is to take steps to bring China into the U.N. This would, in the short run as well as in the long run, be the best American assistance, not only to India but to Tibet and to the cause of world peace in general. It is a curious anomaly that in spite of the best world opinion, the mistake of excluding a powerful government of over 500 million humans from an assembly that purports to represent the whole world irrespective of alliances, and is chartered to discuss all international disputes, is persisted in uncorrected by American commonsense. The position given to Chiang Kai-shek may appear to stand in the way. But it is not too difficult to remove that obstruction. Has not a sufficient trial been given to the fiction to work some change in the situation in China? Chiang Kai-shek and his army cannot really entertain any hope of reconquering China. His place in the U.N. must be limited to the government of Formosa and the legend of his representing China forgotten. With China in the U.N., conflicts such as those that have arisen with India, would be automatically brought under open discussion, in which all parties will have a fair chance of stating and defending their cases, or giving them up as in the Suez affair. If China refused the invitation to join, *she* would stand self-denounced.

The admission of China would not amount to rewarding her for her offences or even to condonation. Membership in the U.N. is not a prize for good conduct. There can be no implication of approval or punishment by either admission or exclusion. It is a status attached to the actuality of established government and nothing more.

As for India's non-alignment, it has automatically been terminated by China's action and Russian non-intervention. India's non-alignment in the cold war was an admirable policy, and helped world peace as long as neither party used violence against India's territory. But when an act of aggression has happened, it is time to recognize and notify that non-alignment has ended. When aggression, open and violent, has taken place, non-alignment becomes peace at any price which certainly is not our policy. If the situation does not call for such a sorry policy, the only question is whether we shall proceed alone and whether we are strong enough for it. The Government and the Government alone is in a postiion to make this appraisal. It should be done without wishful thinking. If, on the other hand, a broader pattern of self-defence has at some stage to be thought of, it is better to take a decision on it at once. Once action is commenced events will move quickly and no advantage is gained by postponement. On the contrary, it will lead to clear disadvantage in every respect.

November 28, 1959 *Swarajya*

NEED TO REVISE NON - ALIGNMENT POLICY

Mr. Jawaharlal Nehru with the approval of all sections of responsible opinion in India followed a strict policy of non-alignment in the cold war. After some cavilling in India and abroad, this policy was found to be not only the wisest line to adopt from

the Indian point of view, but one that enhanced India's ability to serve the cause of world peace. It ultimately obtained the warm approval of even those nations in the West who were originally inclined to be cynical about it. What was a just policy on its own merits proved also to be the wisest policy.

But the path of peace, like that of true love, is not always smooth. China has incontinently betrayed India and Mr. Nehru. He dare not resist Indian public resentment over China's aggression and her attempt to sabotage India's position in the Himalayan frontier. Whatever be China's objective, this aggression and show of power have put an end to any meaning in non-alignment. There can be no non-alignment when one is attacked by the party standing to benefit by non-alignment. It would be base surrender.

It is true that India need not and should not give up her basic policy of peace, just because some other nation has acted violently and aggressively. But love of peace cannot be taken to the limit of surrender to external violent aggression. India's stand as a peace-loving nation is not affected by other people's faults. But India's non-alignment in the cold war has lost meaning when one of the parties to the cold war is guilty of a direct attack on India. China has virtually asked India to join the West.

Some Western observers believe that China has broken loose from Russia's guidance, that Khrushchov has lost control over Mao for some unknown reason. This is not likely to be true. It is more likely that the two communist leaders have come to an agreement among themselves that Russia should keep out of the Sino-Indian conflict and that China should deal with the dispute without involving Russia, because such involvement is certain to have an adverse effect on the rapprochement that is going on between America and Russia and which Khrushchov desires should bear fruit. We note that the U.S. Government also is in a similar mood of non-alignment in the dispute between India and China. There is thus a coincidence of policy bet-

ween Russia and America, almost amounting to an agreed tactic for both of them to keep out of the Sino-Indian quarrel. Mr. Christian Herter's statement stands unaltered in spite of 'clarifications.' America chooses now to be neutral in spite of every goodwill towards India, just as India stood neutral in spite of her goodwill towards America. It is not a case of tit for tat, but a curious result of circumstances. Our non-alignment is shattered against our will and, instead, America and Britain have taken up a policy of non-alignment when we stand in need of alignment !

There is no good discussing now what might have been, had we adopted a policy of alignment in the cold war when our alignment could have issued from a position of strength, so to say. Today our desire to get America and Britain on our side would be one born of weakness. It has become a seller's market. They hold back. It is no use analysing the might-have-beens. We must appraise the present position and see what has to be done.

Mr. Herter was frank enough to give expression to America's policy. It is no use seeking to put pressure to make him talk a different language. Language may differ while the mind behind it remains the same and, as no doubt decided upon after full consideration, for neutrality. We gain nothing by polite or ambiguous expressions obtained by pressure of some kind. Indeed, one should exert to find the mind behind the language and not seek to get the words altered into a sweeter tone, which helps but little. Our basic friendship no doubt remains intact; but in this quarrel with China we cannot get America to involve herself. She is engaged in the big task of peace with Russia and cannot afford to be diverted. Both Russia and America are eager for friendship, and do not desire to spoil the chances for the sake of India.

It is self-deception to expect Russia to embarrass China, or even to desist from helping her if she requires it. At present

Russia is helping China best by keeping out of this quarrel, and thereby keeping America also out of it.

The Prime Minister of India has made himself largely responsible for it by what he failed to do during the long period over which the aggression was spread. It may be easily perceived that our national plans must be thoroughly revised to meet the calls from the Defence Ministry. We cannot conceal our difficulties by brave words. There is a limit to taxation clothed in any manner.

We must seek other ways of adding to our strength than just imported equipment. The situation brings all the nations affected by China's aggressive attitude nearer to one another. It is not right policy for India to reject Pakistan's offer for a joint defence. The time has arrived for a broad pattern of defence to be devised, in which the southern nations of Asia should all be brought together. Not only can Pakistan and India any longer remain apart, but there is cause for all the nations south of Chinese borders to come closer together. This inevitably leads to Asia being divided into two camps. But it cannot be helped as long as communism is what it is. Our antipathy to military alliance should not lead us to a futile loneliness. Pakistan's offer is worth serious consideration. Indeed, an effort should be made for the building up of a broader pattern of self-defence in Asia boldly discarding outworn antipathies and prejudices. If we have to woo the West, it could be done more effectively from a position of strength on behalf of the entire body of non-communist nations in South Asia.

In my article to *The Hindustan Times* dated February 7, this year [see pages 274-6] I have expressed the view that a joint defence arrangement between Pakistan and India would be essential for the security and progress of both countries. We shall be acting unwisely if we make our disputes with Pakistan an impediment in the way of providing a proper defence against a common enemy. General Ayub Khan has publicly made his

offer, and it would be inconsistent with our awareness of the dangers in the present position if we reject an offer which in effect coincides with what Gandhiji offered to Jinnah.

December 5, 1959 *Swarajya*

IMMORAL USE OF PARTY POWER

Calling the Swatantra Party names is no answer to the challenge of that party. The conscience of the Congress Party is aware of its present rotten inside. The Congress today has become a parasite of the Government. Its influence and its pomp rest entirely on State power and State finance. It has lost all moral authority. When autonomy came to the provinces in 1937 and also when Independence was conceded by Britain in 1947, the Congress gave strength and moral power to Government. But today all that the Congress does is to suck power from the vast official organization of the State, both at the Centre and in the States. It gives nothing, but takes everything. The Welfare State structure has become a rich mine for this exploitation.

The members of the Congress Party wield official influence without sharing in the responsibility of the officials. When a crisis brews, the official is thrown to the wolves and the party man is secure from attack or investigation. The 'voluntary' contribution that the Congress Party gets today would astonish the dead patriots who paid or collected money for the Congress in 1920. The methods and means, too, are poles apart from those employed in the old days. The Congress was the beloved of the poor in those days and was respected by the wealthy and the powerful. Now it is the terror and the detestation of everyone that has anything to lose and has a stake in the welfare of the country.

How long can the character of officials hold when the political party that governs and gives orders has gone rotten? They remained good for a considerable time but there is a limit to staying power under evil conditions. They, too, have lost the public respect that they had once enjoyed.

The socialism through which Mr. Jawaharlal Nehru seeks to produce national welfare is the sucking up of all national resources by the State and the entrustment of spending it on production work to officials. These have to exercise their functions under the interested supervision of party men and subject to their 'palace' influence. This, over and above their own incompetence and want of interest in the fruits of their exertion. In the best of circumstances, production is ill done through officials replacing the personal interest that encourages and produces in private effort.

In the rotten atmosphere of the present Congress Party, under whose baneful influence all officials have to work, it is no wonder that public money goes greatly to waste in the country.

The Swatantra Party seeks to stop, or at least reduce, this great waste. When newspapers give support to the new party, the Prime Minister seeks to find strange explanations and calls the party names. He has stated that I have attacked him 'personally'. I should like to know a single instance of this. I have the highest regard and affection for him. What I do not like are his policies in internal affairs. When the whole country went against him over China, I maintained that China's misconduct should not be laid on his shoulders and that it was a pure case of betrayal of him by the leaders of China whom he had trusted, and no fault on his part.

He thinks that under the control and management of his officials, production will go up and will be better than under private ownership. I think this is an erroneous belief as

applied to this country and that it will emasculate the nation and spread corruption, besides causing loss in vital types of production. He thinks he is helping the poor. I think he is causing the drying up of capital and thereby increasing unemployment among the poor. He thinks he is making people industrious and patriotic. I think he is making them more and more lazy, money-minded and poor in spirit, more and more afraid of the Government and Government officials, and more and more disgusted with them, instead of feeling that the Government is their own and an organization to protect them.

With due deference to the P.M's expressed opinion, I maintain that the value of the new party is worth the trouble and annoyance involved in building it up. It may save democracy for India.

It may be that I often use rather strong language in describing the conditions prevailing under the domination of the Congress Party. It is the expression of my soul's revulsion at the improper and immoral use of party power and the manner and degree in which the opportunities afforded by the 'welfare' State are exploited by party bosses for the advantage of the party and of oneself and one's *suta magadha bandins* at all levels, things that would be revolting to the conscience of the Father of the Nation whose picture adorns the walls of the Congress and government offices.

December 12, 1959 *Swarajya*

STIFLING ECONOMIC ENTERPRISE

It is remarkable that in this scientific and rationalistic age, centralized economic planning by the State has been raised to the pedestal of a holy cult. The dominant theme in India for some years past has been the economic uplift of the masses,

and centralized all-out planning has been resorted to as the means of promoting that object. And this, in spite of reiterated lip-service to decentralization. The major fault of centralized, comprehensive planning is that it imposes a monolithic burden on a people composed of diverse elements at all levels and in all occupations. The achievements that it might show in a few selected areas are bought at the cost of the freedom and enterprise of the individual. The individual and his creative ability are smothered by a proliferating bureaucracy and innumerable rules and regulations.

Planning should not be looked upon as an end in itself. It is essential to place it in its proper perspective and to realize its political consequences. In the life of a nation, 12 or 15 years is but an infinitesimally small period. Broader visions should not be obscured by momentary fancies or by the exaggerated importance given to certain things. Everyone knows that it was Soviet Russia which implemented first the concept of centralized, comprehensive State planning. When it was realized in the West that the industrial revolution of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries had led to concentration of capital in a few hands, the socialist idea of State ownership of the means of production, distribution and exchange was developed in Europe, in order supposedly to ensure equitable distribution of the goods and services produced by large-scale mechanization. This movement took the form of a protest against the operation of *laissez faire* capitalism and a demand for parliamentary democratic methods to bring about complete State ownership. Communism went further and resorted to every weapon in its armoury, including force and fraud, to bring about the same end. Both sought to overlook the laws of the free market. Through Central State planning, both socialism and communism brought into being and promoted the huge Leviathan of the State, subordinating the individual to the dictates of a small band of people who maintained their own power and covered all their sins of omission and commission with the fog of a paradise to come.

A 'command economy' thus came into existence. The planners arrogated to themselves the wisdom required for assessing and mobilizing all the resources of the country, determining a comprehensive scheme of priorities, ordering industrial and agrarian growth along certain pre-determined patterns, and fixing prices and patterns of distribution of the goods and services produced. They thus undermined the freedom of mutual services as well as democracy. It is yet to be shown whether this 'command economy' of centralized, comprehensive planning guarantees efficiency in production. The odds are against it. On the distribution front, it has already been proved a tragic failure. During his visit to India a couple of years ago, Mr. Anastas Mikoyan acknowledged that the difference between the lowest and highest paid in Russia ranged from 1 : 59. According to others the difference is 1 : 100 or more. The figures, by themselves, do not give an idea of the distribution picture which was indeed the socialist carrot before the donkey. We have to include what cannot be expressed in terms of money, all the pain inflicted on the souls of people and all the bodily miseries they are made to undergo in the name of comprehensive planning.

After liquidating millions of people, communism has given birth to a new class and a new feudalism instead of abolishing class distinctions and privileges. Party members, less than 4 percent of the people, enjoy all the privileges of life in the name of over 200 million people who are forced to do hard work. So much for centralized State planning in a regime unencumbered by democratic notions. Though these things are well known, they need reiteration today because we are apt to be carried away into imitating communist policies and methods in our blind admiration for their achievements, overlooking the cost, which is a grim human tragedy. The Prime Minister, in his presidential address at the Lucknow session of the Indian National Congress in 1936, made a statement which looks pathetic today in the light of subsequent disclosures about the actual state of affairs in communist countries. I refer to it

because Mr. Nehru is essentially the same man now as he was when he made this statement. His admiration of power and achievement is still misleading him. He said :

> It is interesting to read in that monumental and impressive record, the Webbs's new book on Russia, how the whole Soviet structure is based on a wide and living democratic foundation. Russia is not supposed to be a democratic country after the Western pattern, and yet we find the essentials of democracy present in far greater degree among the masses there than anywhere else. The 600,000 towns and villages there have a vast democratic organization, each with its own soviet, constantly discussing, debating, criticizing, helping in the formulation of policy, electing representatives to higher committees. This organization of citizens covers the entire population over 18 years of age. There is yet another vast organization of the people as producers, and a third, equally vast, as consumers. And thus scores of millions of men and women are constantly taking part in the discussion of public affairs and actually in the administration of the country. There has been no such practical application of the democratic process in history.

As I have said above, Mr. Nehru's admiration of Russian success has not come to an end. It is taking different and various forms at national cost. Modern States have all to do some sort of planning to keep the economy on an even keel. But that need not necessarily be comprehensive, centralized planning which inevitably leads to the restriction of democratic liberties. Physical controls, rationing, inflation, forced savings, that is, large cuts in real wages, and a relentless subordination of life to dictatorship are required to achieve anything like near-success in that type of planning. The lesson from the history of our contemporaries is that planning should be subject to, and in consonance with, democratic principles. Such planning is practicable as well as desirable.

As against this, planning has proceeded in our country on the assumption that people do not know what is good for them and, therefore, they must be told what to do. It has proceeded

on the basis that a few bright persons are omniscient and are capable of directing the destinies of the nation in an infallible manner. We have had many warnings to teach us humility. The Bhakra dam, which was described as the new and real temple for India, can be aptly described as the projection of our folly in thinking that big names are the best things. It must come as a revelation to all of us that, apart from crores of rupees sunk into this mammoth project, the danger of anything going wrong with the dam would be an inundation of indescribable magnitude. The bigger a man builds, the smaller becomes his control over the things he builds. What I deplore is not the building of this particular dam but the megalomania for big projects. These projects have a political corollary—the centralization of all authority, to the detriment of the future of the nation. Until and unless we develop to a stage when the requisite administrative set-up, technical skill and, above all, conscience are all geared to the needs of such projects, it is foolhardy to venture on them.

Mechanization saves bodily labour and ensures more leisure. For these reasons, mechanization has to be welcomed. But to force mechanization at a rate inconsistent with the availability of technical skills to deal with breakdowns in the vast rural area is to prescribe remedies worse than the disease. Agriculture is our basic asset for leading to the growth of a viable industrial sector. The machines and their operation should be introduced at a pace consonant with the needs and genius of our people. Changing the structure of ownership and tenures at a time when a food crisis is admitted would be like changing horses in mid-stream.

The application of misleading statistical standards to our economic performance is wrong. Our economy is still largely a barter economy. In the rural areas a number of transactions are not measured in terms of money. It is a common and good practice in villages to pay farm labour with foodgrains and a small cash sum rather than entirely in cash. Increases in the

issue of salaries to government employees and the expansion of the official set-up falsify calculations of the increase in national income. Apart from this, to emphasize the statistical methods in terms of money is to give a materialistic direction to the general mentality of the people by over-emphasizing the money angle. This is a subtle evil which has already done great harm. Money is important, but unselfishness and moral qualities are more important even for economic progress.

The Government resorts to policies which depreciate the value of the currency. It pumps money into circulation in paying the bills for the ambitious projects it has undertaken. The fixed-income groups in all sectors suffer greatly as a result of deficit financing and are perplexed as to the means of livelihood for their future. Savings become meaningless, because the value of money depreciates year after year. Without savings, there can be no investment, and no increase in wealth.

Centralization is the necessary corollary of present policies, whatever lip-service may be rendered to the doctrine of decentralization. Such decentralization as impinges favourably on electoral plans and programmes is favoured, and not that which really leads to efficiency. The policy of a regulated economy in the production and distribution of food has to be carried to its logical conclusion, as Mr. Ajit Prasad Jain confessed when he resigned from the Central Food and Agriculture Ministry. When socialists and communists talk of decentralization, they mean decentralization of minor powers in execution. The decision-making authority is always the *elite,* the small core, which arrogates to itself all wisdom and infallibility.

The megalomania that vitiates the present development policies is illustrated by the stupendous folly of the contemplated nuclear power station. What we need is not just big projects, but useful and fruitful projects. There is nothing inherently wrong with bigness, just as there is nothing inherently good in bigness. Big dams are good, but more essential are thousands

of small projects which could be and would be executed by the enthusiasm of the local people because they directly and immediately improve their lives. So also in the setting up of industries, there should be encouragement to industries producing consumer goods, which give content and meaning to the phrase 'standard of living' and which can be produced in small and medium scale industries. Private enterprise should be fostered by every means available and not treated as a dangerous enemy. Industrial enterprise would then spread at various levels in the countryside and reduce the tensions that attach to centralized industrialism.

The federal structure of India is not only not used but is sought to be, sabotaged. For instance, although industries are today listed by the Constitution under the State Schedule (excepting strategic industries), those who wish to start industries must all rush to New Delhi for permits and comply with or otherwise negotiate a host of regulations. As a consequence, unemployment stands unchanged. It will be argued that there should be co-ordination and uniformity. But economic development takes place faster when diversity is permitted and the fullest use is made of local, physical and social conditions by those who know them.

One of the most neglected aspects of planning in this country is the gearing up of the administrative machinery and the simplification of procedures. It is no use directing appeals of patriotism to clerks whose personal lives cannot permit room for any thought beyond their day-to-day household troubles. Unless conditions are radically changed to provide incentives, to remove inefficiency and to fix responsibility, economic development in this country will be hampered by the very administrative machinery which is supposed to help it.

The role of the Government should be that of a catalyst in stimulating economic development while individual initiative and enterprise are given the fullest play. The Government can

do a great deal by way of providing a network of highways and village roads, in improving waterways and developing small harbours, improving communication and transit facilities, which would all serve to boost the economy. Many important things have been neglected because the Government has forgotten them in its obsession with a 'command economy'. Wise planning means Government help to foster private enterprise and self-help among individuals. Otherwise, there can be no real progress.

December 17, 1959 Supplement to *Capital*

FREEDOM WITHIN SWATANTRA PARTY

A correspondent asks me whether on account of the interests of the Swatantra Party, I have given up my fight for the retention of the Union official language. Otherwise, why, he asks, I am silent about it these days? The language issue as well as some other matters have been deliberately left out of the stated principles of the new party. They are free subjects for the members of the party. It does not mean that because I do not speak about them as often as I used to, my personal views in respect of those subjects have altered. I hold as strongly as ever that the Union official language should continue to be English. But this is not the Swatantra Party's creed. It is my personal opinion, for which I shall continue to press as strongly as ever.

Similarly, I hold as strongly as ever that Prohibition should not be scrapped where it has been made the law. Again, I hold as strongly as ever that nuclear weapons should be done away with, although I do not speak much on the subject these days. My view that B.C.G. is pure and dangerous quackery, and that the money spent on it is sheer waste, is the same as ever although

I do not expatiate on it now. I have said and agitated enough on all these subjects. My present preoccupations should not be interpreted to mean a change of opinion on those matters on which I am reticent for the time being.

My personal view is that the amendment of the law of intestate Hindu succession which seeks to give an equal share to one's female issues in respect of landed property, at one stroke, doubles that evil of fragmentation of land and increases the number of scattered uneconomical units. My personal view is that testamentary rights now enjoyed by everyone give enough scope for doing justice to unprovided daughters and that there is no need for automatic and compulsory doubling of the process of fragmentation of land, multiplication of absentee ownerships of small bits of cultivable land, some theoretically belonging to wife and some to husband. The large peasant population of the country will not be a whit happier, as a result of the extention to girls of rights of inheritance to landed property. Nothing is gained but much will be lost for agriculture as a whole and family harmony by reason of this doubling of fragmentation for exhibitionist equality. Girls in our country belonging to agricultural families all marry and become equal partners with their husbands in all that they hold. Cases requiring any special provision for girls may and should be provided for by testament.

These remarks are all in respect of lands and do not refer to money or other moveable property. Further, these views are my personal views. They were not discussed or incorporated in the principles of the Swatantra Party, and I feel that they should be left to the free vote of all sections of the nation to be settled in a calm atmosphere in the light of all the pros and cons, and without being driven to vote one way or another by party motives and party directives.

December 19, 1959 *Swarajya*

UNWISDOM IN FOREIGN POLICY

THE question in the face of the persistent attitude of China is one of adequate defence without unnecessary bellicosity. The objective of China in these encroachments is probably not a quixotic enterprise of conquering India, but of undermining India's traditional connections with the Himalayan States and peoples. In a measure, one may feel, this has unfortunately been achieved already as a result of our failure to take the right steps at the right time. It would be impolitic to go into further analysis. We must recover lost ground in this respect. We cannot afford to allow the Himalayan peoples to feel that it is better for them to depend on China rather than on their traditional friend, India. To let this realignment develop would be fatal.

Mere affirmations of friendship and strength in Parliament or elsewhere cannot cope with the factual situation. We may be ahead of these Himalayan peoples in modern civilization, but they are not wanting in shrewdness. They know what is what. Unless we gather fresh concrete strength, their respect for us and consequent attachment to us cannot be restored. Then the question is, which way lies fresh strength? Not in merely buying equipment on loans, but in strong bonds of international treaty with the other non-communist peoples of Asia, newly forged as an answer to the challenge of communist China. Wisdom lies in this direction and not in spurning offers of friendship and partnership in defence.

We are elated by American goodwill. It was a mistake ever to have doubted it. But let us not delude ourselves in that connection. We should approach America with some power and influence behind us and not as just a poor relation in difficulties.

The *Gita* has long ago advised against gifts which are *pariklishtam,* given unwillingly, or *asatkrtam* or *avajnaatam,* given without respect and with half-hidden contempt. I do not say that this is a description of any aid we shall get from America, civil or military. But it is well to take the warning given in the *Gita.* We should clothe ourselves with new power when it has become necessary to ask for help from the West. This new power can come if we exert in Asia among the nations who do not want communist domination and build up strong new bonds of friendships. We must forget the past in connection with Pakistan and look upon our common dangers as more important than, and overriding, anything that divides us. We must look west and east of us in Asia and consolidate our moral position which has been seriously damaged by China's continuing recalcitrance and hostility. If, thus, we acquire some new power we can receive help from America on a footing not of a repentant poor relation but on the basis of having something to give in our turn. A complete revision of our attitude and activities in respect of foreign policy is therefore called for. What has been damaged cannot be set right easily or perfectly, but repair is imperatively called for. We cannot maintain a lonely and unaided antagonism on two fronts, not to mention in this connection our internal problems which render even one front a very disturbing factor. Friendships are being offered. Let us not reject them but examine every proposal casting off pride and prejudice.

The Indian policy of non-alignment was the answer to the challenge of the cold war. It was a creed presented to all the uninvolved nations to take no sides in the cold war and to remain uninvolved in the fullest sense. It was a recipe to starve out this evil thing called the cold war that has brought such ruinous waste of world resources into being and developed internal fear and suspicion into a monstrous enemy of all life. But this creed of non-alignment cannot have any relevance or meaning when one of the nations engaged in the cold war makes aggression on the territory of an uninvolved nation. It is a

travesty of the doctrine of non-alignment to desist from every step relevant to defending oneself against positive aggression.

Moscow cannot complain if India takes these measures. They have become necessary on account of Moscow's inability, indifference or unwillingness to influence her great ally in the direction that would have kept India's non-alignment in force.

December 26, 1959 *Swarajya*

WHERE WE DIFFER

Some of the sympathetic critics of the Swatantra Party argue that, if closely examined, there are hardly any differences between what have been laid as its principles and the actual programmes cautiously pursued by the Congress Party, whatever the latter's grandiose doctrines may be. It is pointed out that there is little socialism in the actual working of Congress policy, that the organization of co-operative services will take all the available energy of the Government before it can think of collective farming, or any other of the great things it keeps talking about. This may be all true. Indeed, responsible political parties in all countries do approximate one another greatly and, in the ultimate analysis, opposing parties fight against one another at elections but differ very little from one another when it comes to *action* as distinguished from thinking and talking. The great political parties in the democracies of America and Britain furnish illustrations of this broad statement. But we should remember that thought brings about progressive action in the direction of the former. Political groupings centre not on what is actually done, but what is promised and apprehended. There is no doubt that while the stress is on freedom in the Swatantra Party, the present ruling party is firmly convinced that nothing but State

action can bring about prosperity and progress. There is little doubt that in the opinion of the Congress Party the people cannot be trusted, that the section on whose votes they must hold power is incapable of protecting itself, and that the section which furnishes the finance necessary for government is incapable of good conduct, unless controlled as ex-criminals are watched and controlled. This attitude makes the distinction between parties and not what they actually dare to do today. If we desire less and less of annoying controls and regulations and more and more of reliance on the conscience and good sense of the people, we must support the Swatantra Party.

Philosophy may look airy but it is the philosophy to which a political party is devoted that in time shapes policies and colours the administration. The Swatantra Party believes that "government by virtue is better than government by law" as Confucius put it. To distrust the people and to put all civic life under regulations, to deliver the people to the tender mercies of officials, will end in the emasculation of the people and in killing all initiative and incentive to creative effort.

It is wrong to ignore the numerous big and small endowments and charities in the country founded by the rich, and to imagine that the poverty of the poor people is due only to the crimes of the rich. *Dharma* sustained and still is the sustaining power of society, and not to see this is blindness. On *dharma* we must depend as the human body depends on its blood. We must nourish this vital element and make it healthier and more adequate for an increasingly rich national life, not treat it as a fantasy of a bygone age and non-existent in the present times. It is here the Swatantra Party differs from the party that rules. We want more and more of the inner law and less and less of outer compulsion, if we wish to become a great people.

December 26, 1959 *Swarajya*

A GAP IN OUR POLICY

THE need for avoiding full scale war or even what may possibly lead to it, is at the back of the Prime Minister's China policy and his statements on the subject of the China trespasses. This is quite understandable. But it would be good to admit frankly that we have to submit to the mischief and suffer what may be considered loss of national prestige, putting the issues plainly before the people, instead of pursuing a policy of capitalizing foreign aggression for the purpose of recovering full totalitarian loyalties in internal affairs. Apart from this mis-utilization of shot which came without our asking, what makes a big gap in our policies is the absence of a definite plan of building up friendship as a bulwark against what has become now more than possible. China has exhibited clear signs of hostility, and readiness to disregard our rights and our honour and prestige, and to undermine our influence on the border peoples.

There are people who feel, without expressing it, that it is good to undergo any risks rather than attempt to live on better terms with our hated next-door neighbour, Pakistan. This the Prime Minister knows and feels. It is the most vicious psychological enemy to any good plan of anti-communist defence. It requires time to effect a change in national prejudices. But time is also dangerously going against us and we cannot always afford to be hesitant. We should, on certain occasions, manfully clear the air and make people think sanely. Leadership cannot afford to be led in critical situations. Nothing is gained by vague and warlike appeals which serve only to capitalize fear for purposes other than war and to cover up economic error and financial bungling. The Powers abroad are shrewd watchers and unless we vigorously take up, with courage and casting aside pride and prejudice, an active programme of building up international friendships, we shall not be able to achieve real prestige in the

international field. We should realize the unpleasant truth that the West is resolved to be unconcerned and hardly seeks to hide it. It probably thinks that our love of peace leans to appeasement, despite our brave words. These are apt to be insouciant until we otherwise secure strength enough to attract their attention and respect.

தன் துணையின்று ஆல்
பகையிரண்டு ஆல் தான் ஒருவன்
இன் துணையாக் கொள்க
அவற்றின் ஒன்று.

"You have no allies. You are faced with two enemies. Make it up with one of them and make of him a good ally," said Tiruvalluvar in his *Kural*.

January 2, 1960 *Swarajya*

THE STATE AND THE CITIZENS

We feed and nourish the five senses, for they are necessary for life's work. But unless we are vigilant and make special efforts through what has been called Yoga, they are apt to usurp mastery over us and lead us to evil. Instead of being servants of the inner man, they tend to make the man their slave.

The relationship between the State and the citizens is much the same as between the senses and the human spirit. The State is an organization to serve the citizens, to function as an instrument for their safety and welfare. But the tendency of the State is to become the master and make the citizens its bond-slaves. This reversal of function and status is what the Swatantra Party

seeks to correct. There is no question that the State is as necessary for national life as the senses are to the human spirit. But equally necessary is it to let the State know, and remain where it shoud and not allow it to trespass.

Even as the senses are apt to drag, if allowed, the mind along their own way, the State with its enormous power tends to assume authority and establish an oppressive dictatorship over the citizens. The administrative machine as well as the political party that controls it are composed of men, who not only do not produce but do not have any experience or real knowledge of the processes of production, but seek to control and direct such activities.

It is forgotten that national production is made up of individual production and that this is best furthered through that full and accurate knowledge and right judgment which follow from personal interest. The function of the State must be to prevent mutual conflict and injury and no more, certainly not to substitute itself for the individual.

What is wanted is a synthesis of the two principles of general welfare, maximum freedom and minimum government. It will not do for any political party to presume that it is, by itself, capable of this synthesis. It is only when two parties standing up respectively for each of these two principles function together in parliamentary democracy, one as Government and the other as Opposition, that a proper synthesis will issue out of it, the measure of each pull being a variable quantity from time to time. Which should have the role of Government and which that of Opposition would also depend on circumstances changing from time to time.

Much of the criticism offered by objective observers of the Swatantra Party is based on ignoring this truth, that a proper synthesis must issue from day to day in the governance of the country on the parliamentary system and as a result of the two

opposing forces. The demand that the Swatantra Party should itself, beforehand, do all the accommodation and synthesis necessary is not only erroneous but represents the approach of those who are inclined to one-party government. It is not consistent with the principles of parliamentary government.

January 9, 1960 *Swarajya*

SUBVERSION OF DEMOCRACY

"SAVE democracy in Kerala" is the current slogan of the United Front formed against the communists in the State. This slogan has another and wider application. "Save democracy for India," one may say with greater realism. 'Socialism' threatens democracy all over India and not only Kerala. And a threat to democracy in India is a greater danger than anything that is in the offing in Kerala.

Making the people and their progress and prosperity dependent on the State, and adopting in the name of socialism the method of regimentation that is identified with communism, reducing the States virtually to nobodies under the iron rule of the Centre with its single party rule, means subversion of democracy as conceived by those that made the Constitution of India. The replacement of parliamentary methods by multiple year Plans, framed and executed by a single party organization, reduces parliamentary democracy to a mockery. This 'Welfare State' run on these long-term, rigid Plans hands over all power over men and their works, and their lives, to the political party organization controlling the State. Without even the trouble of indoctrination every vote is, through power and intimidation, permanently secured for the ruling party. The socialist way leads to unchangeable one-party rule and to the death of democracy. The consequence is inescapable.

"The belief still seems to prevail in the party hierarchy that all that is necessary to galvanize the wheels of progress is a fiat from Delhi," writes Mr. Frank Moraes in a recent article. The truth is worse than that. There is no such belief, but it is the only method adopted and followed without faith.

"Had Gandhiji lived longer," Mr. Moraes writes in the same article, "he might have been able to stop the class war now being conducted behind the devious slogan of a classless society." As against this, "Nehru's India is a country," says Mr. Moraes, "where the State has encroached into almost every domain of individual life and initiative, breeding in the process a vast army of bureaucrats and functioning through a system of wider controls. This stifling of the people's initiative unless checked will end in the unchallenged supremacy of the State, leading to a society where the socialist pattern is virtually indistinguishable from the communist." It is axiomatic, as Mr. Moraes has rightly observed, that the more a people depend on the State, the narrower grows the ambit of democracy. When the State is identified with a single party or with a single individual, 'this trend is aggravated'.

Though forcefully put, this is indeed mildly put. Democracy cannot survive any process by which the citizen is enslaved in his economic life. When the occupations of the people are controlled by a particular political party and its bosses, what chance is there for a free change of opinion or of party affiliation? "I fully agree with all that you say, sir, but how *can* I? Every operation in my business is under the control of the present ruling party bosses. They hold the rope round my neck"—this is what one hears when an approach is made by the Swatantra Party to any person who is doing his bit for production in any field. How can there be a swing of the democratic pendulum under these conditions? The Welfare State *plus* Congress socialism takes away the freedom of choice without which it is axiomatic that democracy cannot survive. Save democracy for India, I say, by discarding the 'socialist pattern' and strengthening the party

that stands for emancipating the citizen from the Congress Party's stranglehold. Fear holds men in thraldom. Resistance is the law of nature that saves men from fear. Surrendering to the promptings of fear leads to the tightening of the rope.

January 16, 1960 *Swarajya*

STATE PROGRAMME OF COMPULSION

ENERGY results from differentials in levels. This is true in the moral and economic fields as in physical dynamics. We must at the lower level maintain the urge to improve one's lot. At the other end we must encourage the urge of sympathy and the innate desire to help those who are in want. These two incentives, the one to raise oneself and the other to help others and, for that purpose, to part with one's possessions, are the priceless features of healthy social life. Any policy that damages these two social urges is harmful. There should be constant motion upwards and downwards, and both motions should be the result of free will. Any programme of State compulsion at levelling tends to atrophy the spirit of enterprise on the one hand and, on the other, to harden sentiments of charity replacing it by its opposite, namely, callousness.

Congress policies have already yielded these harmful results. The sources of private charity have been dried up by heavy calls from the State in various forms. As a result of the policies and statements of the Government, uncertainty has enveloped life. Parity in social and economic conditions must be aimed at in order to generate healthy individual energy, enterprise and compassion. But forcibly directed State egalitarianism results in just the unhealthy opposite of these urges.

We ought not to lose faith in human nature. When Mahatma Gandhi said that the rich should be persuaded to hold their wealth as trustees for those around them, he did not propound an unpractical or alien scheme but said what was both practical and was in the tradition of our people. If only we shed our fear of religion and do not frown on communal philanthropy, we can still organize voluntary social co-operation on a very large scale, which will give satisfaction and joy both to those who have and those who have not. A policy of compulsion is a policy of despair and will be both morally harmful and ineffective in operation. Above all, it ends in blasting incentive and establishing official tyranny.

The Prime Minister of India wants to pack into a few years the economic results that more advanced countries have taken a much longer time to achieve. This is impossible, but the impossibility of it is ignored in the pursuit of spectacular claims to special distinction. Propaganda has thus come to replace the actual promotion of welfare.

Reckless expansion of currency together with centralization of State power, and grants and subsidies to purchase popularity, have spread the mentality of free-money hunger at all levels and made people lose the sense of obligation to repay loans and respect for contracts. Instead of greater industry and self-reliance, dependence on official favours has become the chief feature in commerce and industry.

The cause of poverty and unemployment is insufficiency of production. The remedy is increased production. To increase production, hard work, discipline, efficiency, and the application of right methods and techniques, are essential. These cannot be conjured up overnight. They take time to be properly brought into play. It is the failure of the Congress leaders to realize this fact that is responsible for the disequilibrium, misgovernment and injustice that have come to pass for progress in recent years.

Shortcomings by way of production are now being covered up with plans to distribute property in defiance of moral principles. Two things hold society together, keeping at bay the predatory urges of those individuals who covet their neighbours' goods and possessions. The first is the moral law having the sanction of tradition, that each man is entitled to the fruits of his labour and shall not encroach on what another has acquired in the same manner. The second is the protection of the State for the possession, enjoyment and bequest of what one has legally acquired. Both these principles are being discarded by the Congress rulers in the ostentatious pursuit of what they call socialism, with disastrous consequences to the very incentives that contribute to the nation's wealth.

The policy of expropriation, in order to give land to all the landless, is obviously an impossible policy, as there is not enough land to go round, in whatever manner the owners of land are dispossessed. Dispossessing the owners of land which they have lawfully acquired is an attack on the fundamental basis of social co-operation. Taking land from the owners, and proposing to give it to others, feeds people with greed. Public morals cannot but be gravely undermined when those who have invested hard-earned money in land on the assurance of law, or have inherited it, are arbitrarily deprived of it by State action, while others with no title to it either in the form of work or purchase receive a gift of it.

Every act of injustice leaves behind a trail of hatred as well as disregard of law and morality. Feeding the greed of some sections of the community and filling others with hatred and jealousy, the Congress, in the name of socialism, is destroying the basic foundation of individual morality, substituting predatory lusts for the restraints inherited from religious tradition.

The value of religion to human beings lies in the self-restraint it imposes on them to act justly and fairly to others,

even when they have the power to act otherwise. There is no antidote to abuse of power, except the influence of religion and the code of self-denial inculcated by it. Against the temptations of material ambitions and pursuits and the brutalities they are apt to lead to, religion is society's sole armour and protection.

The loosening of the religious impulse is the worst of the disservices rendered by the Congress to the nation. We must organize a new force and movement to replace the greed and the class hatred of Congress materialism with a renovated spiritual outlook emphasizing the restraints of good conduct as of greater importance than the triumphs of organized covetousness. Every effort should be made to foster and maintain spiritual values and preserve what is good in our national culture and tradition, and avoid the dominance of a purely material philosophy of life which thinks only in terms of the standard of life without any reference to its content or quality.

The laudable desire to raise the standard of life among the masses should not become a pretext for orgies of coercion and sadism. When the techniques for developing popularity for a political party are mixed up with dislocation of ownership engineered with State authority, the administration degenerates into a vast bribe-distributing machinery for preserving that party in position. The nation's morality is sacrificed to party. Discrimination between supporters and opponents is the natural attendant of such schemes. The dismemberment of such integrity of national citizenship as we possessed, creating various classes of citizens, some with privileges and others with disabilities, has been the initial accomplishment of Congress policy, mocking its pretensions as an architect of the welfare State. The exhilaration and joy of voluntary social service should replace the greed and class hatreds generated by the compulsory programmes of socialism. The trusteeship doctrine was propounded by the Mahatma and should be resuscitated as an emergent national imperative. In place of the propaganda, the organized political bribery, the bureaucratization and monolithic centralization of

the present Congress policy, the trusteeship doctrine will introduce into the politics of the country, honesty, good fellowship, high and noble example, and the economy and efficiency of individual attention and dedication. It will substitute the substance and reality of benefit to all in place of the blend of favouritism and victimization of official creation that is now made to look attractive under an imposing facade of high-sounding slogans.

January 23, 1960 *Swarajya*

PROSPERITY OR BANKRUPTCY?

PRIVATE initiative, management with personal interest, honest competition, these are the forces as well as the safeguards that produce prosperity. What is called the French miracle, the recovery of the franc, was described by the miracle-worker himself as the "natural triumph of honesty and commonsense". It is stupid, if not criminal, to spend more than one earns, holds M. Pinay, and this applies to the individual as well as to the nation.

A sound and stable currency is the best protection a government can give to its people, and this is true, says M. Pinay, for employers and workers alike. According to him, social security bought at the price of inflation is a delusion and a fraud.

Political freedom cannot survive unless sustained by economic freedom. This also is M. Pinay's conviction. How relevant all this is to Indian affairs !

The policy of the rulers here in India is social welfare through socialism and deficit financing. 'Deficit financing' is

budget jargon. It means nothing but inflation, the issue of printed paper to meet liabilities arising out of adventure. M. Pinay holds that government controls should be reduced to the indispensable minimum—"something like traffic lights." This French Finance Minister does not mind being called an old-fashioned Liberal. He holds firmly that private initiative, integrity, hard work and thrift are not out-dated virtues. On the contrary, he maintains that these virtues should never be allowed to go out of fashion.

When M. Pinay took over responsibility, France was in a desperate condition. The franc had shrunk to one-twenty-fifth of its pre-war value. Pinay's first objective therefore was to balance the nation's budget. *He cut expenditure instead of raising taxes.* He issued a loan, the repayments of which were pegged to gold, because (he said) it is dishonest to ask people to entrust their savings to government to be repaid in depreciated currency. Again, how greatly relevant when considering Indian affairs !

"Inflation not only undermines the economic foundation of a nation, it weakens its political and social structure, even its morality," said M. Pinay and insisted on a balanced budget as the essential condition for a stable currency. Depreciated currency makes people lose their sense of reality. M. Pinay puts it as strongly as that.

We in India can draw lessons from three miracles, the miracle of West Germany, the miracle of France, and the miracle of Japan. Nations reduced to the dust, all the three have not only recovered, but have prospered and are offering loans to India. How one wishes we borrowed their economic commonsense and not only their money. Their commonsense has enabled them to rehabilitate themselves after the ravages of war by discarding emotional temptations and delusions and shaping their economic policy according to natural laws. Private enterprise, competition and a free market policy gave them full

value for hard work. Instead, we borow from them huge sums to invest in socialism, just what they discarded to regain life.

It is not deficit financing and regulations and controls, and heavy taxation for raising capital to be put in enterprises to be managed by bureaucrats, that will help us to rise. It is private enterprise, integrity and the principle of living within one's means that will help us to make progress. A special congress of the Socialist Party of Germany adopted a programme from which it is clear that Europe rethinks its socialism. "The free choice of consumer goods and services, free choice of a place to work, free initiative for employers, are decisive foundations and free competition is an important element of a free economic policy. Totalitarian control of the economy destroys freedom. The Social Democratic Party, therefore, favours a free market, wherever free competition really exists. As much competition as *possible*—as much planning as *necessary.*" This then is the language of even socialists where the Erhard miracle has made people re-think things over, where they want freedom and justice not as words only but as reality, and where they do not wish anyone to exploit the conflicts of society to establish the dictatorship of a party.

After successive straight election defeats each time by a bigger margin, the Labour Party of Britain has concluded that it should not advocate any further nationalization. The British Liberal leader Mr. Grimond said that there might be some hope for Labour parties only if they got rid of the "albatross of nationalization hanging round their necks". The Government should resist the temptation of seeking to build up popularity for the ruling party by printing money to meet its adventures which results in the depreciation of the currency and the shooting up of prices. The Government should cut down expenditure and not raise money through indirect taxes that will hide themselves in the rising prices, and still further depress the common man's standard of living.

One of the most significant measures taken by M. Pinay to cut down expenditure was the suppression of many of the innumerable government subsidies to agriculture and industry. Our Government, on the other hand, is planning for fantastic subsidies to induce the peasantry to accept the fad of 'voluntary' collectivization. All these subsidies serve to keep government expenditure up and thereby to depress the rupee and make the fulfilment of obligations, private and public, a gross unreality. The party in power and in possession of the public exchequer and the mint can buy votes by subsidies and grants, but these when paid out by deficit financing, destroy the foundation of security and prosperity, viz., a stable currency. Our drive towards social justice should not involve the sacrifice of liberty. We must achieve the one without sacrificing the other. The Congress Party is committing just this mistake in its mad career. The Swatantra Party's emergence may halt this even before the next elections.

It is usually thought, especially by liberals visiting India from Western countries, that such sound principles of polity may not be understood or obtain favour in India where ignorance and poverty hold universal sway, and therefore socialist promises may easily allure. The Constitution has given universal adult suffrage and it may be that our people are largely illiterate and poor. But I believe they have wisdom to perceive the hollowness of socialist promises and the futility of wildcat schemes. The greatest difficulty, however, for poverty-stricken voters is corruption. They may see the hollowness of promises but they may not resist the temptation of immediate bribes. It is here that a party which cannot command the government exchequer and the power that a regimented economy gives to the official party, finds the greatest obstacles. But this is a question of morality and there is no surrendering to it. It must be fought out until the people one day realize what they do for themselves when they cast votes for immediate temptations. It is here that the handicap lies for a people used for generations to undemocratic forms of government. It is not illiteracy that is the

handicap and literacy will not remove it. It is the want of realization of the consequences of dropping a piece of paper in the ballot box, and this can be cured only by gaining experience, and going through the suffering that follows wrong voting. We must not be deterred by difficulties but prayerfully educate the voters against falling into the traps laid for them.

February 6, 1960 *Swarajya*

DANGER OF DRIFT TO STATISM

In spite of Swaraj having been won everyone is in chains. A young man who was frustrated in his political activities and whom I advised taking to some business, asked me in reply : "How can I? It is all government-controlled. I can do nothing unless I get someone to intercede for me in official circles."

The autocratic authority of Britain was transferred to the Congress in 1947. Swarajya has now to be gained by the people as against the Congress. It is a continuing process now. This is the programme before the Swatantra Party. British interests then were covered by benevolent slogans. Now the party interests of the Congress are similarly camouflaged.

The goal of the Swatantra Party is that every citizen should have security and liberty, and none shall be enslaved by poverty, ignorance or unemployment, or by the State. The party wants that the rights and opportunities of the individual should be jealously safeguarded. In all spheres freedom must be our first care.

The party is opposed to State ownership of all the means of production and distribution, which is the creed of socialism. It will not help the increase of production which we so badly

need, nor will it fail to destroy freedom. State ownership and State control must be resorted to in those cases only, where it is established after impartial inquiry that it is necessary in the interests of the community as a whole, and also that it will increase efficiency and production in such a degree as to outweigh the inherent disadvantages.

I have had the advantage of going through a very recent exposition of the principles of the British Liberal Party. The Swatantra Party's principles are just what the British Liberals have emphasized.

We should not relax the drive towards social justice. But in our anxiety about it, or eagerness to achieve it, we should not relax our care for individual freedom. In all countries where there is a drive towards social justice, there is danger of a drift to the total State. We must beware of this. State control over wide areas of national life cannot be imposed without destroying certain essential freedoms.

Democratic socialism is a contradiction in terms. Socialism means the end of individual freedom and of democracy.

The value of personality, private conscience, and private judgment are things that must be saved. If in any society, for any reason the protest against the arbitrary power of the State is hushed, it is no longer a free society.

The self-reliant individual by his energy, industry, inventiveness and readiness to take risks, not only helps himself but adds to the happiness of his fellow-citizens. The nation's welfare is best served when the citizens are hard at work and are individually pursuing each his own private benefit. This is the *swatantra* we stand for.

India is *swatantra* at heart. It is rooted in the national temperament. Accepting tyranny is suicidal, no matter how efficient and dynamic it may be. We should reconcile our urge to social justice with the need for the fullest expression of the

individual. We should achieve security without accepting regimentation as the means to it. We should set free the full vital energy of the whole people. Regimentation kills that vital energy.

Centralization is growing apace and should be halted. "The rush of blood to the head is bad for the country." Socialism and collective planning have led to an unmistakable drift to the totalitarian State. This must be resisted. The power of the State must no doubt be used to protect the weak, to prevent exploitation, and to better the condition of the people. There is no dispute over this. But the dispute is over the extent of State interference that is consistent with democracy. This is where the Swatantra Party comes in. Continual vigilance is necessary. The State has tasted blood and is hungry for more and more power over everybody. The State is handled under our system by a particular political party and the latter talks, thinks and acts in the name of the State.

The articles in Part III of the Constitution were laid down in order to limit and circumscribe what may be done in the name of the State by political parties coming into power from time to time. The aims and objects set out in Part IV of the Constitution should be achieved not by discarding the fundamental rights guaranteed in Part III of the Constitution but by acting within the ambit prescribed by these guarantees. What is sought now to be done by the Congress Party in power is to bring into being a pattern of State activity which the communists work for, and which is contrary to the guarantees contained in the original articles of the Constitution. It is a wrong notion that justice and social welfare can be achieved only by ignoring those guarantees and by imposing the authority of the State and its minions on the life of the people and curtailing the freedom of the citizens.

Human progress must be an organic growth. A regimented society ends in the servile State. The power of the State should be used to release energy, not to fetter it.

We must revive the spiritual outlook that is an integral part of the culture of India and which has suffered damage, in no small measure, by reason of the materialism that has invaded it in the name of progress and enlightenment. It is on the restoration of spiritual values that the hope of our country truly rests.

February 13, 1960 *Swarajya*

PHILOSOPHY OF THE SWATANTRA PARTY

THE fundamental importance of maintaining the freedom of the individual in a modern State will not be questioned by anyone. The increasing difficulty of preserving this freedom in the complex situation created by modern civilization renders it necessary to organize a strong political party in support of it. Some people go as far as to think that, in modern life, individual freedom has no place and that it is a losing battle to fight for it. This is not true. The need for safeguarding this precious fundamental of human happiness is all the greater on account of the expansionist tendency of the modern State. In a country where the government and the people are anxious to bring about speedy development, there is a special need for a political party definitely pledged to this duty, because the government, in its ardour for quick results, is apt to go wrong and brush aside that without which development and prosperity would have no value, even if attained.

Socialism's fundamental error consists in its static notion of happiness. Disparity is the mother of emulation and energy and a healthy drive upwards which is life in its real sense. The socialists set class against class and look to the resulting class hatred to cover the barrenness of their pursuit of parity. The negative and destructive emotions and doctrines issuing out of jealousy and hatred serve no good purpose and undermine moral

values to the detriment of life at all levels. In place of the erroneous static approach of the socialist doctrine, what needs to be realized is the dynamics of true welfare. We must get wealth to move, not remain equalized and static. All joy depends on this motion.

Distribution of wealth resting on *dharma*—the sense of duty felt in the individual conscience—is what the Swatantra Party stands for. Distribution by the compulsion of law is what the socialists stand for, distribution aiming at a dead level which means the negation of happiness. Distribution resting on the force of law has no creative energy. It cannot *produce*. Production under socialism must resort to totalitarian compulsion because emulation has been killed. Distribution by *dharma* keeps alive enterprise, initiative, compassion and all the spiritual values that ennoble life. Socialism which is distribution by law kills every one of these precious things of life from which all civilization and culture have issued.

Distribution by *dharma* has been given the name of the doctrine of trusteeship. Trusteeship is a misleading term by reason of its legal associations. The urge of *dharma* must be encouraged and not replaced by legal compulsion. *Dharma* demands that wealth should be used by the holder not only for oneself but for the benefit of all those around one that need help.

It may be asked, can we rely on *dharma* ? Most certainly, we can and must. The laws and decrees of government are a broken reed. Human society really holds together, resting not on law but on the inner sense of duty. American and German societies have established general welfare and social co-operation, not on the basis of legal compulsion but on *dharma*. India cannot and should not lag behind in this but must also build social welfare on the basis of the moral sense and not on a denial of its efficacy or reality.

There can be no individual freedom unless the right to property is guaranteed protection. Where the possession of property

is treated almost as a crime and the right denied or consigned to uncertainty, individual freedom becomes an unreality. Hence it is that the Swatantra Party stands for preserving the sacredness of property and of contract. The one is the essential condition of freedom, the other is the exercise of that freedom. Socialism seeks to extinguish property and leaves no room for freedom of contract.

The Congress Party in India has pledged itself to socialism without taking lessons from its established failure in other countries. Its leaders imagine that they are modern and progressive, and that those who see the importance of freedom and combine in a political party to defend it, are reactionaries. The Swatantra Party is not a reactionary party but consists of men who prize freedom and spiritual values above any progress or development attained at the cost of individual freedom. Individual freedom has to be subjected to checks when it tends to become anti-social or used for exploitation. Crimes and anti-social activities and exploitation must be punished and prevented, but the law of the prison cannot be extended to a whole nation in the name of a social doctrine. It is pure delusion to think that law can fulfil what the moral sense alone can.

Under parliamentary democracy governments must be formed by majorities; but this does not give them authority to extinguish or restrain the individual freedom of anyone except for the maintenance of peace and order. To curtail freedom on the basis of one's notions as to progress or prosperity is the negation of democracy. It will lead to the development of a new ruling class and its tyranny.

Even in the course of the formation of the Swatantra Party, and notwithstanding the verbal answers given by the ruling Congress Party to the challenge and to the arguments advanced, the public response that the new party has evoked has caused a certain degree of withdrawal and modification in the policies of the Government on the pretext of graduation and explanation. This is welcome, but in order that things may not revert and

in order to maintain a permanent balance of forces so that fresh errors may be prevented, it is necessary to establish a political party with freedom as its philosophical basis. Otherwise, democracy will not work for the good of the nation, and will evolve itself as totalitarianism with an emasculated, voiceless people suffering under the tyranny of a new bureaucracy.

Paternalism is bad, the Indian delegate has argued at the U.N., referring to colonial affairs. What he has called paternalism is bad even as between the State and the people for whose benefit and under whose command the State has come to exist. What is paternalism in a family, becomes totalitarianism in the State although it begins as socialism.

It is easy enough to delude the ignorant and tempt them to give authority by promises that cannot be fulfilled. But it is the function and responsibility of the intelligent to remove illusions and guide the people to see the truth and resist temptations. If the intelligentsia despair and, frightened by the hypnosis of false doctrines, surrender to the follies of the ignorant, woe to that nation. Democracy cannot be justified and wealth will not increase unless the freedom of the individual citizen and his fundamental right to work, earn, keep and invest his earnings, according to his free judgment, is preserved. Otherwise, democracy would be tyranny writ anew.

February 20, 1960 *Swarajya*

MINIMUM GOVERNMENT

THE purpose of our Constitution was that it should define the limits of the power to be exercised by each of the institutions created by it to exercise authority, and it consequently provided safeguards to guarantee the observance of those limits and the

protection of the individual rights against abuse of power. It was in fact what may be called 'Constitutional Legislation' not a mere Constitution. The nation and its citizens were told in advance the limits of the powers and the obligations that would issue out of the acceptance of the Constitution. Only a restricted field of discretion was left to Parliament and the legislatures of the States.

But what in fact has evolved out of the exercise of power by the Congress majority, which was large enough to intoxicate it, is an almost total overthrow of the guarantees provided in the Constitution. The obstructions placed by the State and its interference in the individual's enterprise and avocation have become intolerable. Property, what one has acquired, moveable or immoveable, is not secure. The citizen's occupation is not free from drastic soul-killing annoyances at the hands of officials acting under governmental authority. If this is not questioned and checked at once, we shall soon have a servile State, without even the saving feature of efficiency.

The middle classes are the greatest victims of these evils, for they have not the means of buying off the annoyances and obstructions. Instead of a welfare State, we have a condition of affairs wherein all the active people—men with initiative and imagination—curse government every day. It would be wise for the present generation in our country to limit the main activities of the Government to the task of collecting taxes and preventing crimes of violence, fraud and exploitation. If we could accomplish this, we should feel satisfied and can well leave to later generations any enlargement of the powers of government that they might find desirable. It would be best, in the mean time, to leave men to work each in his own clearly understood individual interest, so that the totality of our national production may grow to the fullest possible extent, without being hampered, restricted and dwarfed by imaginary notions of general welfare seen through narrow party spectacles and borrowed ideals.

February 20, 1960 *Swarajya*

THE RULE OF LAW

THE general plan of the ruling party issues from a half-unconscious desire to exploit its present power and position to continue in that power and position. So it seeks by every means to obtain electoral strength by extinguishing rights held by individuals and transferring them to groups who have a larger number of votes to give to its candidates, when the time comes. It is a kind of bribery. It costs the party nothing, for it takes away from A and gives it to X, Y, Z. And this is done in contravention of the guarantees in the original Constitution. So, squatters, lessees from year to year or for a term, urban tenants and such others are all preferred to those who have invested their hard earned savings in land or house, or other property. Legal ownership and its incidents are disregarded and looked upon as anti-socialist. No owner is now therefore willing to let anyone into temporary possession in a legal and social way, lest he should suffer permanent ouster on account of unreasonable laws at the hands of those let into possession. The daily commerce of life is thus interfered with to the prejudice of everybody.

It is lost sight of that the rule of law is the best guarantee of progress and prosperity. It should never be disregarded for electoral advantages that a particular ruling party may gain, which is a fleeting thing compared to the essential and permanent order that is wanted for society. Law is not whatever is enacted by a majority but something that rests on permanent principles and is inherent in the conscience of a community. It is the rule of law, as thus rightly understood, that supports and holds together a community, not the Austinian concept of law. The Sanskrit word *dharma* denotes it best, the root of *dharma* being 'to sustain'. The authoritarian notion that the will of the majority in Parliament is law is at the bottom of all those pieces of legislation that are hastily and quickly enacted whenever any one of the High Courts or the Supreme Court gives a decision

against the Government. It is a debasement of the rule of law as jurists and publicists understood it. There is a Law of laws which must be respected if democracy is to be consistent with civilization.

February 27, 1960 *Swarajya*

POLICY OF SWATANTRA PARTY

THE Swatantra Party very recently declared itself in favour of a more constructive foreign policy so as to put up an efficient barrier against communist aggression.

While pledged to peace, the party has declared, India should build up a joint and well-knit opposition on the part of the nations of South and South-East Asia so that communist ambitions in Asia could be contained.

If necessary, it holds that Western help may be sought, where it is available for this purpose, on the basis of a united non-communist front without complicating the mutual situation among these nations.

In internal matters, it may be summed up, that the Swatantra Party stands for priority being given to production before equalization of wealth and to efficiency of administration, stamping out corruption and favouritism which are the outcome of State monopolies favoured by the Congress Party.

The party is only six months old but it has already made such progress that the ruling party's main target of attack is no longer the Communist Party but the Swatantra Party.

The meetings held under the Swatantra Party's auspices in urban as well as in rural areas compete well with the gathering

that Mr. Nehru and his followers attract, notwithstanding all the glamour inherited from Congress history. The Government Intelligence Department is in active service to attend and report meetings of the Swatantra Party.

All accounts show that the ruling party looks upon the Swatantra Party as its principal opponent throughout the country. The mutual criticism of the Congress and communist parties have now almost ceased. Every occasion is used to attack only the Swatantra Party and its leaders.

Apart from the fast-growing strength of the new party, independent observers have noted that much needed re-thinking has started in the ruling party's counsels as an immediate result of the impact of the Swatantra Party.

The Congress Party's adoption of the goal of a socialistic pattern of society, and the direction of Government policies to that end, led to the founding of the Swatantra Party pledged to the protection of the freedom of the individual and the fundamental rights required for making that freedom a reality.

The Constitution of India adopted in 1950 guaranteed these rights. It was framed to exclude socialism and to protect through courts of law the means to freedom. But since then, encroachments and amendments have been made to enable the State to take over any property and to create State monopolies, and to expropriate without letting courts assess proper compensation.

A policy of compulsory expropriation of freehold lands has been taken up now in all the States at the instance of the Congress Party. A general drive is set on foot to mop up all savings and to organize production from the Centre. Private enterprise is given a permissive role and stands to be starved out.

The decentralized industrialization of the country, such as is needed to supplement its agricultural economy, has no chance

of growth under the socialist policies of the Congress Party. Centralization of all power has become the Government pattern.

Collectivization of land which has been adopted as the Congress policy in the name of co-operative farming and 'ceilings' on private landholdings threatens to disturb the mechanism of agricultural production in the country at a time when greater production of food-grains is the most urgent problem for the nation.

The larger holdings that offered a chance for mechanization are ordered to be dwarfed by the 'ceiling' proposals. The limit set by the Congress Party and put through by legislation is an area fetching an annual income of about 700 dollars, irrespective of the family's position in regard to debt and obligations or the absence of other income.

Cultivation of small holdings is essentially a family occupation wholly unsuitable to be forced into any collective pattern. Yet this academic policy is persistently adhered to. The Swatantra Party wants the State to assist the peasant proprietors of land and not to force them into collectivization through direct and indirect pressure.

The Swatantra Party is bent on opposing the socialism of the Congress Party, as it will kill enterprise and initiative in the agricultural field and frighten foreign capital in the industrial private sector.

The party stands for decentralization of State power and a policy of creating opportunities and facilities for small-scale private industries widely distributed over the country.

The Swatantra Party is pledged to justice and equality of opportunity for all people without discrimination on the ground of political affiliation. It holds that the progress and happiness of the people depend on individual initiative and enterprise, and

stands for the principle of maximum freedom for the individual and minimum interference by the State, consistent with the obligation to prevent and punish anti-social activities. This is just the opposite of the Congress Party's present policy.

The will-o'-the-wisp of socialist dogma has led the Congress Party to forget that national production is made up of individual production and this is best furthered through the eagerness to excel and that full and accurate knowledge which follow from personal interest.

Among those engaged in significant productive occupations, there is now a prevailing sense of insecurity and uncertainty generated by the socialist goal of the Congress. The Congress Party's hesitant procedure towards its declared goal only adds to the vicious uncertainty that deters enterprise.

The Swatantra Party is pledged to the fostering of spiritual values and to resisting the dominance of a purely materialist philosophy of life and the encouragement of class hatred which are the inescapable results of the socialist drive of the Congress Party.

The party stands for reducing the burden of direct and indirect taxation and for thrift in official expenditure. It seeks a reversal of financial policies leading to excessive inflation and high prices.

March 1960 — In "Asia Speaks" series of *United Press International*

THE LAND CEILING LAWS

"No property shall be compulsorily acquired or requisitioned save for a public purpose." This is the Constitution. It is not to be interpreted so as to mean "No property shall be compul-

sorily acquired or requisitioned save when a State legislature considers it a good thing to do". For, then, it would be as good as there being no restriction whatsoever on the laws that can be enacted for compulsory acquisition. The Constitution clearly intended to limit it by saying 'for a public purpose'.

The Land Ceilings Bills in the various States framed under the direction of the Congress Party are repugnant not only to the spirit but also to the letter of the Constitution. No application can be made at once to the High Courts for an appropriate writ as it would be premature until the legislative process is completed. But it would be well to examine the position even now. It appears clear that these proposed laws for compulsory acquisition will be contrary to the Constitution, unless Article 31 is once again amended so as to dispense with the restrictive phrase 'for a public purpose'. Acquisition for working out socialism or any other 'ism is not covered by the phrase 'for a public purpose', which connotes a definite concrete purpose to be facilitated or furthered by such acquisition. The compulsory acquisition cannot be justified when the only object is the acquisition itself.

The amendments to the article hitherto made only dealt with the question of compensation which they have now made non-justiciable or nearly so. They have not touched or reduced the fundamental limitation, viz., the nature of the purposes for which the compulsory acquisition can be made, which remain as originally laid down.

The courts have no doubt interpreted the meaning of 'a public purpose' to include many things, such as acquisition for a sports club, a literary association, a reading room and such like purpose, over and above the usual public purposes of land acquisition such as opening out roads and the construction of public offices, hospitals, etc. The interpretational extension does not do away with the fundamental condition that some concrete purpose must be the object of the acquisition and not merely a doctrinal

aim. The wording of the article is clear and it cannot be extended to cover acquisition for acquisition's sake. Ownership cannot be extinguished under this article for the mere purpose of extinguishing individual ownership, making, so to say, expropriation justify itself.

The object for which any compulsory acquisition can be made (apart from the question of compensation) is defined in the same terms as in the old Land Acquisition Acts. The phrase 'for a public purpose' cannot be made to include the desire to experiment in socialism or any other 'ism. The phrase cannot cover an ideology as distinguished from a specific and concrete object. In fact Article 31 in the Constitution was conceived for the purpose of prohibiting acquisition under the socialist doctrine and for limiting it only to the objects for which compulsory acquisition had been made under the old laws.

If doctrinal objects could be brought under the article, then there was no need for any limiting phrase. It could just have been laid down without any condition as to the purpose, that no acquisition could be made except after payment of compensation. The inclusion of the phrase 'for a public purpose' or in the plural as it was in the original Constitution 'for public purposes', definitely prohibits socialistic expropriation either with or without compensation.

It must be obvious, on the other hand, to anyone that any plan of acquisition after paying compensation for the purpose of creating a socialistic pattern of life is futile. The communists are right there. For we cannot hope to help or gain anything for the community by taking over land if we have to create at the same time a money equivalent and give it to the dispossessed individual. We add to the indebtedness of the community in equal measure so as to nullify what has been gained for it. Hence the dishonest and tortuous measures adopted to reduce the compensation to be paid, and this carried to ridiculous lengths. And the issue of adequacy of compensation is made

in effect non-justiciable. Surely the laws of a country should not take the shape of trickery of this kind.

We know of instances where the market value would be Rs. 100,000 but under the proposed laws and the method of computing 'compensation' prescribed therein it would be less than Rs. 7,000. And there can be no appeal to courts. If there is one fundamental principle governing the laws to be made under the Constitution, it is that the legislatures should not be made the instruments of fraud. It is a fraud on its powers if a legislature passes 'principles of computing compensation', which would be patently unjust and oppressive. It may be tyranny to acquire without compensation, but it is no less so and, in addition, a patent fraud to use the provisions of the amended article, so as to cheat the citizen of his property worth one lakh by paying him a tenth of that sum and calling it 'compensation'. Under just laws over and above market value, an additional amount was payable as solatium for compulsory acquisition. We are not dealing with feudal rights, but with property acquired or inherited which represents investment.

The point as to compensation apart, the whole procedure is beyond the powers given by the Constitution. It is *ultra vires* unless, without going through the process of amending the Constitution, we force an interpretation on the phrase 'for a public purpose' to mean "whenever Parliament or the State legislature deems it expedient".

March 5, 1960 *Swarajya*

COMPULSION OR FAITH IN THE PEOPLE?

At all times and in all places the temptation is great for good men to think of resorting to available force when there is some injustice to be removed or some reform to be made. For, it

always seems a surer and quicker way than to trust to the goodness of men and adopt methods of persuasion. The truth remains, however, that force, although it may achieve something at once, always leaves behind something that is opposed to justice or welfare and neutralizes what good has been achieved. Often it does not succeed in really achieving what was wanted to be achieved.

Force is not only what is ordinarily known and obvious as something that hurts. Compulsion through legal processes is also force. Social reform by decree of State falls in the category of force although hidden from the eye. It leaves a trail of pain just like ordinary physical assaults on the person of a wrong-doer, and results in as much evil as good, and the evil shows itself sometimes at once and sometimes not at once, but in course of time. Whenever we can follow the way of persuasion, it is best to pursue that course, although it may appear too slow and doubtful a process to meet the evil.

Persuasion and the methods of non-violence are based on the faith that the conscience of men can be reached. Compulsion is resorted to by men who are impatient for results and are not disposed to wait or who have no faith in their fellowmen, and believe that only compulsion can achieve results.

I receive letters from people who ask me whether I really believe the rich will follow the *dharma* preached by Gandhiji and, not believing this, they prefer the socialist plan to the Swatantra plan. Their credulity is as great as their mistrust. They do not examine things to see whether the promises of the socialists can be fulfilled at all in the circumstances of this country. They do not question but take it for granted that the socialist plans of government will remove the poverty of our country. That I oppose this is sufficient cause for these credulous people to accept the claim as a proved alternative. On the other hand, their mistrust is applied in full measure when dealing with the programme of the Swatantra Party and the doctrine of trusteeship or *oppuravu*, on which it is based. They say they cannot

believe the rich and so my method will fail. They do not realize the elementary truth that there is no wealth for the State to distribute it through socialism. Wealth has to be produced, and it can be produced by work and through investment of capital. Capital is not the wicked product of capitalism. It is as necessary that investments must be made to produce wealth as seed is necessary to raise crops.

Work cannot be expected without the incentive of individual interest and the guarantee that everyone will be protected in the enjoyment of what one has acquired. Without freedom of vocation and contract, and the fundamental guarantee about property, there can be no incentive to the production of wealth.

It is futile to imagine that State departments can produce wealth for the enjoyment of it by forty crores of people spread over two million square miles. What can possibly be done for a small population occupying a few hundred square miles cannot be done by a government responsible for the welfare of four hundred millions. The only feasible way of production of wealth is by making it the attractive business and responsibility of individuals composing the nation. Socialism is the opposite of this.

The Swatantra Party is based on this fundamental doctrine of individual production of wealth in such measure as to permit of distribution ; all attempts to put the cart before the horse will end in a fall in national production with all its dire consequences.

Faith in our fellow-beings is the religious foundation of a civilized community. We are a civilized community. I cannot accept the theory that *dharma* is a futility. If I do so, it must also follow that a government founded on the votes of a people to whom *dharma* is a futility cannot be expected to govern justly or achieve good for the people, in spite of the people being bad. Nor can I accept the theory that all rich men are bad and the poor are impeccable. Those who argue that the individual cannot be trusted, cut the ground from under their feet. If individuals cannot be trusted, no more can the few be trusted

who are popular with them and to whom they periodically give authority through their votes. These are plain truths and on these truths are founded the age-long reliance on religion, conscience and *dharma* in all countries and the evolution of the laws of property, contract and freedom of occupation. All nations accepted those fundamentals, until recently men began to argue fallaciously that they can be done away with without prejudice to progress and civilization and freedom.

The blind reliance on compulsion as a means for good ends actuates the conduct of political parties. There is too great an amount of suppression of free thinking and freedom of speech and action. Political and civic action are sought to be patterned on military discipline with the result that intellectual thinking processes are put out of action and atrophied. A total reliance on party discipline is developed. The party, in fact, vanishes in the authoritarianism of a coterie. A correspondent wrote to me pointing out that the leaders of the Swatantra Party spoke in different voices about the China affairs and deplored this. Far from deploring, I consider it proper that accepting certain fundamentals, people should think freely and differently and say what they feel. The emotions of a people should be reflected truthfully in expression and not suppressed or doctored to suit the ideas and behests of party leaders. Truth demands consistency between thought and speech. It is wrong policy to make speech and thought differ in order to produce a deceptive uniformity in any political party. The Congress is following this wrong policy. The Swatantra Party has shown a new way to people in its 21st article. The Swatantra Party holds that democracy is best served if every political party allows freedom of opinion to its members on all matters outside the fundamental principles of the party. It therefore gives its members full liberty on all questions not falling within the scope of the principles stated.

I feel (and have stated) that we cannot go to war with China but must rely on moral pressure to stop her aggression and make her withdraw from the trespass she has indulged in. We must,

therefore, devise ways to gather and put this moral pressure to use. I do not condemn the invitation to talk wherever and whenever it may be if, as the Prime Minister says, he is firm in his determination not to make it a path to surrender. Some of my colleagues do not feel quite sure of this determination and apprehend danger, and they have expressed themselves in language which differs from mine. Must I ask them to suppress their fears or hide them ? No, on the contrary, we serve the nation better by speaking out and allowing every one to speak out frankly. Those who imagine that the Swatantra Party is split over this issue are sadly mistaken. We believe in truth and freedom. There is unanimity as to principles and I think the Prime Minister and the world should know how we feel although we are agreed that negotiation and moral pressure must do what in the olden days war was expected to do.

I give below the letter and my reply thereto.

Your recent statement supporting Pandit Nehru's action in having invited the Chinese Premier to New Delhi for holding talks on the border dispute is quite welcome. China is our neighbour and, as such, the border issue should not for long be kept on the tenter-hooks of suspense. The settlement of the comparable Sino-Burma border question on the basis of the MacMahon Line is a pointer that now wiser counsels prevail in the Chinese camp.

By contrast, the attitude of your other Swatantra colleagues like Minoo Masani on Nehru's action is highly deplorable, to say the least. The convolutions of the Swatantra Party high-ups are most perlexing indeed. The party speaks with many voices and the contradictory views and statements of its leaders on almost every issue of national importance are such as to put to shade the much-talking ministers of the ruling party who are notorious for talking differently on policy matters. In the incipient stage of the new party's formation, such failings might have been excusable. As, however, the position has now changed, I take it that you have been unable to rectify it. I really sympathise with your present lot—a good man fallen among Free Enterprisers. What have you to say about it all, dear Rajaji ?

This is my reply:

> I do not believe in steam-rolling opinions and expression of views. A party is founded on certain important fundamental principles. On other matters, I believe political parties should not censor or bring under whip different views or differences in emphasis. If you ponder over what Mr. Masani or others have said and what I have said, you will see there is no real difference. But even if there be difference I like such free expression on such matters. I don't like the uniformity insisted on and enforced by the Congress. This is what I have to say about it.

March 5, 1960 *Swarajya*

STABLE OR TOTALITARIAN?

The vaunted champions of the poor and guardians of egalitarianist politics have framed the year's budget so as to befriend the rich for the time being and transfer crushing burdens on to the shoulders of the consumers of all kinds of goods. The indirect taxes on essential basic goods and on transport serve the purpose of concealing the Government levy in rising prices, spreading the results of planned indiscretion on as wide an area of consumers as possible, so that the population ratio of poor and rich may help the tax collection to the utmost point. The Finance Minister knows his multiplication table. There is more revenue in taxing the poor than in quarrelling with the rich.

The capitalists including those engaged in trade and commerce, and in all kinds of production, are to be approached for election finance well in advance of the coming general elections and here is a budget that boldly and shamelessly befriends them. "We have laid no new tax burdens on you and you must, therefore, fill our election coffers so that you may have a *stable*

government." This will be the slogan for collection of party funds.

'Stable' is totalitarian writ anew and underlined. The Congress Government is sure to be that, if the bait of negative favours of this year's budget will be swallowed by the rich businessmen and industrialists. Some of these, perhaps most, may be prepared for suicide and accept the silken rope of this pre-election 'tax-free' budget to be put round their necks. It is a strange trick on the part of the vaunted poor man's party, this 'socialist pattern' party, that such heavy excise duties are proposed in order to cover the deficit, and such dangerous large obligations abroad are entered into for the sake of making it easy to collect an astronomical figure for election purposes, so that another term of unquestioned totalitarian rule may be guaranteed for the Congress Party.

The profits of nationalized concerns are a tax on the consumers and this is entirely within the grasp of the ruling party over and above the tax on all the basic materials of private industry, small and big. In addition, there are the Railway receipts on movement of goods as if the chronic inflation were not enough. No greater all-out use can be conceived of governmental and legislative power for party purposes. Yet the kettle called the pot black when in Kerala the communists tried to obtain some party advantage from their possession of a little power through provincial autonomy. What the Communist Party did in Kerala is being done and planned on a gigantic scale by the Congress Party all over India. The election law is so framed that any amount may be spent by the party. And ministers in power may move about with cash in their large purses at election time, surrounded by emblems of authority. Provided the candidate keeps his official accounts within the limits laid down, all is well under the law.

This is as absurd as absurd can be. If officials must prove their innocence when their bank account increases, if the posses-

sion of stolen property must give rise to a presumption of crime, political parties must explain the movements up and down of their fat purses. At least, when a minister of the ruling party goes about during election time with money in his pocket, he must explain how he got rid of it, and why.

Collections for election funds have begun already in 'advanced' provinces. Industrialists and businessmen are called to tea by important ministers and discussions and promises are held and given as when public loans are floated. They are told to support the party that offers a 'stable' government. Tyranny will be stable, if people can be duped and intimidated so easily. Alas for a measure of courage among our businessmen along with so much superficial shrewdness, so that democracy can be saved from too 'stable' governments.

March 12, 1960 *Swarajya*

SOCIALISM IN DEEP ECLIPSE

Mr. William Henry Chamberlin, after fifteen weeks in Western Europe, writes in the *Indian Libertarian* that he has brought back from that recent visit the predominant impression that socialism as a political and intellectual force in Europe has "gone into deep eclipse".

"The communists have long been cast into political oblivion. The socialists are also at a low ebb." Three times running in the two most industrialized countries of Europe, England and Germany, he points out, the moderate or Conservative Party defeated the Socialist Party. The conservatives won in three straight contests, increasing their majority each time !

We are told by Mr. Chamberlin that the membership of the French Socialist Party has declined from three and a half lakhs

to 50,000, and that the diminished socialist ranks are riddled with factional feuds. In Belgium and the Netherlands, socialists are no longer in the coalition governments of those countries.

In all the larger countries of Europe, there is no disagreement among those who make vital decisions as to free movement of men, goods and capital, or as to the inadvisability of direct State intervention in economic affairs.

What cost the Socialist Party in England a good many marginal votes at the polls is, according to Mr. Chamberlin, their unreasonable attachment to theories of State planning. "Most Britons like most other people," says Mr. Chamberlin, "prefer the idea that all income belongs to the recipients." They do not believe in the theory that the business of the State is to redistribute wealth.

In Germany, too, demonstrated prosperity under a system of free enterprise was more attractive to the voters than "the socialist appeals to class envy and socialist promises." One of the most popular slogans of the winning party in Germany was "No experiments" (*Keine Experimente*). "Germany's spectacular recovery from the ruin and desolation of the war began," says Mr. Chamberlin, "from the time when a stable currency and a free market economy were established and there was no desire to tamper with either of these bases of prosperity."

March 12, 1960 *Swarajya*

WORKERS' ROLE IN SWATANTRA

A democracy is certain sooner or later to become a totalitarian tyranny if there is no party in opposition. The opposition party must stand for principles that counter-balance what forms the chief plank of the ruling party. This polarization is necessary to

prevent democracy from becoming a field of adventurist experiment, on the one hand, or unjust class government, on the other.

Why do we oppose the ruling party and its administration? The answer is, because it is wasteful and inefficient and because the Congress Party works the administration for strengthening the party rather than for the good of the people. In this, they in no way differ from what the Communist Party is alleged to have done in Kerala. The ruling party is utilising the power and resources of the administration to strengthen itself to be elected to power over and over again.

And then the question arises, what is the harm if the Congress Party is strengthened? What is wrong with the Congress Party? We oppose that party because it has adopted socialism as its creed. That there should be social justice and social co-operation is common ground. But socialism is not the way to these objectives. Socialist policies must lead to the gradual and complete centralization of all real power in the State at the cost of individual freedom, initiative and enterprise. The bureaucracy at all levels becomes master, holding the strings of all the elements of the economic life of the people, and the citizens will be at its mercy at every point. This has already happened in great measure and is on the ascending curve. Industrialists and businessmen of all grades are today under fear of the Government and the official army, such as they never suffered in pre-Independence British rule.

Not only local initiative and autonomy but the freedom of occupation and other essential rights conferred by the Constitution on the citizen are undermined and made into a nullity. Centralization of power necessarily results in waste, inefficiency and favouritism at all levels.

The Swatantra Party stands for the encouragement of individual initiative and enterprise by making it sure for every citizen that he enjoys the benefits resulting from his work. It

stands for minimum regulation by the State and maximum freedom and initiative and enterprise for the citizen.

The State should not seek to be a new Zemindar or a giant capitalist but should take only what is necessary for its upkeep and for the protection and welfare of those who cannot help themselves. Officialdom should not seek to be the master of everything giving doles to the citizens out of the general till. The position should be the reverse. The producer should be entitled to what he produces and he should be asked to part with just what the State needs.

Socialist policies breed class jealousy, hatred and disharmony. They work to the detriment of all the productive processes necessary for increasing the country's prosperity. The Swatantra Party stands for harmony and mutual co-operation as against the class envy and hatred fostered for advancing the socialist pattern "aimed at by the Congress Party."

The constructive work of the Swatantra members, in accordance with the philosophy of the party, should be a constant endeavour to get those whom they can influence, and who are in a fortunate position to help those who stand in need of help. They should seek ways and means to influence the wealthy to establish institutions and endow funds for the welfare of the less fortunate people. There should be a continuous activity to cause people to look upon their possessions as entrusted to them by the Almighty for being utilised as far as possible for the benefit of others. The party stands for the fostering of spiritual values and happiness through philanthropy, either general where possible or limited to select areas or communities where this is easier, so that in the end all may be benefited. This should be treated as the constructive work of the party to supplement its political work to reinforce the freedom of the citizens as against the inroads of the State and its claim to be the general manager of all professions and sole distributor of benefactions.

DISARMAMENT TALKS

THE hope of mankind rests on the issue of the total disarmament talks initiated by Premier Khrushchov and the United States President. There is no other means of escape from the Frankenstein of A and H bombs.

There is no avoiding disaster except through the world law scheme, so well and thoroughly expounded in the great Harvard book of Grenville Clark and Prof. Louis Sohn, *World Peace Through World Law*, of which the first essential is agreed total disarmament. America must move energetically to get the first step through and to have the scheme accepted by the U.N. Otherwise, the fate of mankind will be sealed.

Things are not bright at all in Europe after De Gaulle's successful' Sahara test. The NATO Supreme Commander is not making it easy for the great men who strive for disarmament and world law. We cannot quarrel with Moscow radio's condemnation of the Supreme Commander's proposal at this juncture for a nuclear mobile force. It is bound to undermine confidence which is so essential for progress at the Summit meeting.

It seems as if anti-humanity forces, beyond control, are gathering strength against Mr. Eisenhower's peace objective. It looked like fair weather till recently, but the Sahara test has unfortunately been the signal for dark clouds to gather again. But we must hope against hope.

There is tremendous work before the American President. All good men and women must unite to send their devout prayers for him and his mission of peace.—*The New York Times.*

April 23, 1960

Swarajya

UNCONSTITUTIONAL

The Land Ceiling Bill introduced in the Madras Assembly is not consistent with constitutional law. The compulsory acquisition of land on a State-wide scale that is proposed in it is not authorized even by the amended article of the Constitution. The proposed acquisition is not for any concrete public purpose, but is an acquisition sought to be made in pursuance of a dogma of land reform which cannot be a public purpose as laid down in the article. The proposal seeks to be its own purpose and justification. The compensation clauses are a fraud upon the powers vested by the Constitution in the State legislatures. On their very face, the so-called principles, according to which compensation is proposed to be given, are wrong and contrary to the spirit of the Constitution. The arbitrary will of the framers of the law is sought to be passed off as 'principles'. The least that propriety demands is that this bill which seeks, in effect, to ignore the rights which the Constitution has guaranteed and which according to the mover of the bill is revolutionary whether 'white' or 'red', should be withheld until 1962 and the electorate's approval obtained for the State-wide confiscatory measure.

Apart from this democratic procedure, it is necessary, meanwhile, that the President should obtain the opinion of the Supreme Court whether the provisions of this bill (and of similar bills in other States) are not contrary to the provisions of the Constitution as to the purpose for which land is sought to be compulsorily acquired on a large scale and whether the proprosals as to the principles on which compensation is sought to be given are not a fraud on the powers vested by the relevant article of the Constitution in the State legislatures. It is most inexpedient as well as unfair that the whole gamut of legislative process should be gone through, and executive action taken thereon, before the important and basic constitutional question

is properly and fairly investigated by the proper authority after hearing both sides. Having regard to the nature and public importance of the questions involved a reference by the President to the Supreme Court under Article 143 is absolutely essential in the interests of justice and fairplay.

April 23, 1960 *Swarajya*

CONFISCATORY POLICIES OF CONGRESS

In answer to my charge that the cheap and confiscatory effort of the Congress Government to reduce inequalities by expropriation of the bigger landowners is unconstitutional, Mr. Bhaktavatsalam endeavoured to plead an *estoppel* against me. How can I object to arbitrariness, he asked, when I did such and such things arbitrarily and without reference to the electorate for a specific mandate. He pointed out that I was responsible for the law of Prohibition of government drink shops, for the law that abolished zemindaris, for the law that relieved from their debts all those peasants who had actually paid by way of interest more than twice the principal which they had borrowed, for the law that opened the Hindu temples to all classes of Hindus irrespective of their having been for long deemed untouchable, and for the law that was passed in 1952 which gave a large proportion of the harvest to the tiller in the delta area, and he seriously pleaded that I who was responsible for all these arbitrary things should be estopped from bringing forward the charge of arbitrariness against the Madras Land Ceiling Bill. Ignorant people in Upper India regions who lived under the zemindari system may not understand the difference between a ryotwari holder of a hundred acres and a rent-collector or Rajah who collected land revenue from holders of land and paid *peishcush* to the Government. But Mr. Bhaktavatsalam has no excuse for equating ryotwari owners of land with zemindars and other intermediaries.

The biggest farm owner in Tanjore is still a full owner of his land and is not an intermediary. Mr. Bhaktavatsalam knows this and it is disingenuous of him to put forth this argument. It may deceive Parliamentarians in Northern India or British politicians ignorant of India. But the people of India, and in particular the citizens of ryotwari regions, will see the error of Mr. Bhaktavatsalam's plea. A big bank account may be taxed higher than a little man's small hoard but the essential character of the two is the same. There can be no confiscation on the ground of size. It would be an infringement of the fundamental rights guaranteed by the Constitution to attempt to do it. Reduction of inequalities by confiscation is not authorized by the Constitution which we have adopted. Such confiscation is not land reform but a violation of the rule of law.

Be all these as it may, any arbitrariness on my part, even if it be proved, is no justification for the present arbitrariness. Nor can I be estopped from seeking to protect the citizens against infringement of their constitutional rights. The Congress governments must defend their acts by demonstrating that they are consistent with the Constitution. It is not enough for them to say that I did such things and cannot myself object. The country is not governed by precedents taken from my action but by the Constitution. And I want them to submit the question to the Supreme Court or squarely to the electorate. That the Congress was returned to power is not enough to show that the electorate authorized the grasping of peasant proprietors' lands on the ground that they exceed a limit of thirty acres per family today and to offer to give a compensation, which is obviously inadequate and is an evasion of constitutional obligations.

Nor is it constitutional for the Congress Party to seek favour with voters by robbing the temples and religious institutions and charitable trusts, offering to give them cheap money in lieu of paddy fields and gardens, whose yields were sustaining those institutions to maintain which the donors and benefactors and previous governments dedicated those lands. Endowments of

land sustain institutions in spite of rising prices, but money grants fail to cope wth the price spiral.

Apart from the Constitution these confiscatory policies are fundamentally immoral and like every other crime and immoral act tend to destroy good conscience and the sense of right and wrong among the people. No wonder crimes of all sorts have gone up and are still on the increase. The king cannot indulge in crime and expect the people not to follow his example.

But Mr. Bhaktavatsalam's incidental disclosure that the Government intends to give away 'surplus lands' to the tenants now in occupation is a definite step towards clarification. It proves that the stories told by Congress workers to the Harijans that they will be the beneficiaries of these confiscations is all falsehood. These unfortunate and hungry voters need no longer be under any such delusion. A party that allows its workers to tell dishonest stories to dupe the voters is not entitled to any confidence. Either this is the case or Mr. Bhaktavatsalam was not speaking the truth when he said on the floor of the House that the lands would go to the tenants who will be asked to pay for them in instalments.

What a sorry policy as far as the nation's debts are concerned ! Why should this be done, which will add to the public debt and which will not yield a single additional measure of rice, but on the contrary reduce the area of cultivation by planting litigation where paddy was growing ?

April 30, 1960 *Swarajya*

CREEPING TYRANNY OF SOCIALIST PATTERN

THE uncandid and creeping totalitarianism of the Nehru-guided Congress Party is worse than the avowed totalitarianism of the orthodox communists. The latter challenge us to a straightforward duel. The issues in that duel are clear and our *dharma* has a definite advantage and can be sure of victory. The uncandid and creeping totalitarianism involved in the socialism of the Congress is the more dangerous evil, inasmuch as it deceives and dupes all the way along and drives public opinion and press and nation inescapably into the lane that holds State compulsion and regimented life at its dead end. The advantage of a straightforward issue is great for those who have to resist tyranny. It calls forth all the latent energy of a nation and its capacity for sacrifice, whereas the creeping totalitarian tyranny of the socialist pattern disarms the citizens, divides them into classes and weakens them by inspiring and setting up mutual conflicts, and through State power prevents sacrifice from organizing itself against tyranny. The immediate annoyance is made to look bigger than the coming greater evil and the enemy pushes his way into what otherwise would be an impregnable fortress.

And this is the programme of an institution which has the history of political emancipation on its flag to hide its present rotten interior. How can we be disloyal to Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru? This is the question that puzzles the noble hearts of our youth and blocks their intellect. God bless them for their noble instincts. But loyalty does not and should not mean approval of the ideology which the Government has today chosen to inflict on the nation, and on which it has proceeded to build its policies in all matters. We may recognize all its past claims but need not and should not accept the implications of their present unwise policy and the ill-thought-out laws and decrees issuing therefrom.

There is no piece of legislation more full of thoughtlessness than the Land Ceilings Bills now launched on the direction of the Centre in all the States. Apart from its numerous flaws and illogicalities, fragmentation of land is the great enemy of the nation and it is trebled and quadrupled by the insensate policy of confiscation of 'excess' land. This 'excess' land serves as buffers against the effects of the laws of succession that fragmented all the smaller farms. The acceleration of an evil was never found to be a remedy for that evil, and yet this is the creed of the ruling party, judged from its acts whatever its own illusion may be. This acceleration invites scarcity of food supplies to industrial and urban centres to come down at double speed and create the need for total and detailed controls in all spheres.

Jealousy and hatred never were, and never can be, wisdom or be the basis of national polity. Yet this has become the philosophy and the bible of the Congress. "Inequalities must go"; therefore, says the ruling party, we confiscate the 'surplus' above the proper average as we lay it down.

And the ambiguity in the creed of the special socialism of the Indian National Congress leads to a further increase of national debt without even the satisfaction of having fulfilled the claims of the expropriated farmers for just compensation. The injury is not alone to the victims of expropriation but to the nation as well, which is to be burdened with fresh interest and debt charges for no productive purpose, but for the sake of a disproductive dogma of distribution put before the production of additional wealth.

All this will lead the country to the inescapable end of accepting totalitarian tyranny—unless we resist it now and prevent its destructive march.

April 30, 1960 *Swarajya*

DROP ISOLATIONISM

It would not be an overstatement if one said that Mr. Jawaharlal Nehru's guiding principle of life is to be in accord with popular feeling. His own opinion may be the contrary, but it always gets ultimately suppressed and wiped out if he sees that popular feeling goes the opposite way. The latter finally becomes his own conviction !

The division of India into linguistic States is an instance of this, which has been wrought into the internal affairs of our country. The 'firm' attitude held by him in the Chou En-lai talks is in consonance with the same guiding principle of peace with the crowd. It is not firmness. He has only followed the line of least resistance with Indian popular feeling. The invitation to the Chinese Premier to come for talks to Delhi was very probably with a different object. But from the outset, the talks became a purposeless formality. When he found the people all over the country were angry, Mr. Jawaharlal Nehru made up his mind to be 'firm'. Mr. Chou En-lai need not have been invited at all for this kind of talk and so much money need not have been spent over security measures, a necessary corollary of the invitation. We are where we were. And the aggression on Ladakh remains stabilized. "We shall not give up an inch of our territory", "We shall continue to defend Ladakh"—these slogans continue to be mouthed while 10,000 square miles of Ladakh are allowed to be in enemy possession, making a mockery of it all.

Our armed forces can be used against this trespass, but no one can guarantee the localization of conflict. It would be foolish to start an operation knowing fully well that it would be a leap in the dark. The only legitimate and wise course is to drop the isolationist policy which we have been hugging to

our bosom, and get into closer bonds of alliance with the world Powers that are ranged against communism. Even this may not perhaps be easy at this late stage. The West may not relish this belated gesture on the part of India. All gestures lose much of their potential when they are made not in due time but after one finds oneself in a quandary. But there is no other way, and so it must be followed, for the rehabilitation of India's prestige and gathering of moral power against the aggressor. The West may probably see the long-range advantage of the open entry of India, Burma and Indonesia in the Western front against communism and welcome it.

The issue boils down to whether we want continued isolationism with Ladakh gone, placing one's trust in the Chinese word that there will be no more aggression on her part, or the candid abrogation of non-alignment with every prospect of being able firmly to face communist aggression with powerful friends on our side. The hope that Soviet Russia will step into the controversy and help India to recover her prestige and territory is illusory. On the other hand, it is possible to activate Russia in that direction only when she sees India slipping away from non-alignment. The Soviet Chief may then see point in his intervention.

All these steps in reasoning may lose much of their force when threshed out in public. They should guide Mr. Jawaharlal Nehru without any public discussion and shape his future policy. There is no profit in getting the praises of American newspapers over the 'firm' attitude taken in the talks with the Chinese Premier, if this is not to be followed up by a brave step taken to drop our isolationist policy as being no longer tenable, and follow a positive line along with the Western anti-communist bloc.

May 7, 1960 *Swarajya*

APARTHEID

Mr. Eric Louw is adamant and the Commonwealth Conference has been able to do nothing with him. The affair has finished or will finish exactly like the Nehru-Chou talks in Delhi. The British Premier has, as usual, come off victorious having skilfully and successfully protected the South African Government against official censure. But this does not reduce the pitch of world disapproval which is universal and severe.

Lord Altrincham's characterization of the Commonwealth is not mere hot stuff—it is true and just. It is an unreal and impotent association, is a form of snobbery, and has no spiritual content whatsoever.

Not that, given this racialism, there is no case for *apartheid*. The Boers should have been told that if they want *apartheid* they should carry it forward to its logical end. The Boers had better be allotted an area in South Africa proportionate to their population and asked to shift for themselves within that boundary, on any principle of their choice, and not claim to govern the Africans and rule over a vast area, maintaining *apartheid* against the majority. The country should be partitioned off on the basis of the population ratio and white South Africans may have *apartheid* to their hearts' content, viz., live by themselves without having to mix with coloured people in that area. They cannot claim helotry to be a political philosophy in a civilized age. If this division be not conceivably possible, then the policy of *apartheid* must be given up and a just and equitable policy accepted.

May 14, 1960 *Swarajya*

RABINDRANATH TAGORE

ART and wisdom blended together in Rabindranath Tagore's mind. Saraswati of the Hindu pantheon is goddess of wisdom as well as of all the fine arts. Tagore sought to shape human thought, word and activity in one beautiful whole, worthy in form and substance alike, and as an offering unto the universal Spirit Divine. The poet saw beauty and goodness and wisdom as things not apart from one another, but blended. He saw patriotism and world-fellowship in one integrated whole. Art and literature and politics, all went together to make the whole great man that he was. He despised ugliness, and it was ugliness if any one of these things ignored or neglected the rest. If politics parted from aesthetics or worship of the Divine, he saw in it distortion, failure and ignorance. This integrated vision is perhaps common to all poets, but in Tagore on the background of Indian renaissance, it was particularly marked, as other active participants generally saw things isolated from one another and sometimes in conflict.

May 14, 1960 *Swarajya*

FIELD WORKERS

SOME one has written—one whose insight is obvious—that Chinese aggression has provided Congress leaders with that most necessary of all political elements—an enemy symbol, which they had sadly lacked since the departure of the British. The Chinese aggression is a windfall for Mr. Nehru— paradoxical as it may appear on the background of the too obvious bad management of external affairs, which has been the subject matter of so much

attack in Parliament. People feel they should present a united front against the great aggressor and not weaken the Government by quarrelling with it on other matters.

Mr. Sanjiva Reddy, too, thinks he can find and use an enemy symbol to good purpose in his new job of mothering the Congress organization. He referred to the Swatantra Party, when talking to pressmen in Madras, and said that the party had 'absolutely no chance'. "Where are the field workers for them?" he asked proudly.

It is true we do not command the money which the Congress does, and invests it in 'field workers'. Notwithstanding this, the Swatantra Party is not without its eager and earnest workers. What is most important is that these workers are truly voluntary and not just paid agents. No doubt the connection with Government is a great advantage to the Congress field workers. But the Swatantra Party believes that these Congress field workers themselves do the Swatantra Party's job too. Every false promise made by them, when exposed, becomes a fatal shaft on our behalf. Every Congressman who uses his good offices with administrative officers, to benefit somebody, is an unconscious field worker for the Swatantra Party. The Swatantra Party is confident that the field workers of the Congress can do the Swatantra movement no harm but do great good. Minister Bhaktavatsalam's disclosure in the Madras Legislature that the 'surplus' land under the Ceilings Bill will go to the present lessees has undone the best part of the work done recently by these Congress field workers. The promises made to Harijans have been falsified.

Once upon a time, forty years ago, the Congress had genuine field workers who were not hired, but they rose like locusts of their own accord in the countryside. They were real workers who were the strength of the Congress, and took it to success. The Swatantra Party believes that a genuine movement gives birth to such field workers, provided the district leaders of the

party play their part honestly and actively. We are on the whole grateful to Mr. Sanjiva Reddy for warning and drawing the attention of Swatantra leaders to the importance of field workers.

May 14, 1960 *Swarajya*

LAYS AXE AT THE ROOT

Eminent men have subjected the Land Ceilings Bills introduced at the instance of the Congress Party, and now discussed in many State legislatures, to detailed criticism. The defects, errors and contradictions in these proposals have been pointed out by men fully qualified to deal with the subject. Without going into these details, two major considerations may be set out as to why these bills deserve to be totally resisted.

The proposals, if carried out, will hurt the supply of grain to the urban markets and aggravate the food problem. The ceiling legislation will reduce all farms under single management to less than 30 acres at once and very soon, as a result of the laws of inheritance, to less than three acres each. Easily a generation produces ten shares. The grain that moves at present to feed industrial workers and others working in public and commercial establishments in urban areas, is the surplus produce of the larger farms. The produce raised by smaller cultivators is generally consumed by the families of the farmers and of those who work on land either regularly or during seasons. What remains over goes into petty hoarding for security, which is always a matter of great concern with the rural population. As a result of the proposed ceiling legislation, all farms will soon and irrevocably fall in the latter class, and the flow of grain to urban markets will be greatly reduced or disappear. This is not merely a theoretical conclusion. It is supported by the experience in communist countries where, when small peasants replaced

the big landowners, a great drop occurred in the supply of grain to urban areas and thereafter a coercive collectivization programme was enforced.

What is given the name of food problem in our country is a scarce supply to urban markets and a consequent rise in price in those markets, which later affects sales everywhere. Thus, it may be prophesied that we shall have an acute worsening of the food problem as a result of this legislation. It will affect the cost of production and bring about a general rise in prices. What must necessarily follow is a programme of compulsory procurement and government storage and licensing, with all their attendant and well-known difficulties into which it is unnecessary to go, as these are now matters of general experience and disgust.

The second consideration is one of principle, the basis of our social culture. The legislation lays its axe at the root of of our life. The fundamental rights reduced to written articles in our Constitution are not just words borrowed from foreign constitutions but form the foundation of our culture. The freedom guaranteed in the Constitution to the citizen is inextricably associated with the right to acquire, to hold and enjoy property, and to follow any business or occupation of one's own choice, which the people of civilized countries all over the world enjoyed without question. There can be no freedom where the right to acquire property is questioned or not protected. A moment's reflection will confirm this truth. The legislation we are dealing with aims a blow at the right to acquire and hold lands as property. Apart from whether it is right or wrong to do so, it must be recognized that it is a change of vast significance. The Ceilings Bills deal a blow at the spirit and intent of the fundamental law regarding acquisition and enjoyment of property. Once we allow this we shall not be able to resist the subsequent and inescapable attacks on all that we have held inviolable so far. With property, the sacredness of contract also must go.

The first step is always the all-important point at which both innovators, on the one hand, and those who resist it on the other, have to direct their attention. The Constitution of India as was framed in 1950 is definitely a pattern that recognizes and guarantees freedom of occupation, freedom of acquisition and the inviolability of property. Once a breach is made in the fort, we shall not be able to resist further invasions. The innovators, too, have planned this only as the first stage in a continuing operation towards the goal of collectivization. Even if they do not intend it, they cannot but follow up with a total invasion of all that has been hitherto considered sacred and inviolable.

The Congress Party may get amendments of the articles of the Constitution passed, so as to remove impediments, and facilitate the conversion of the will of the socialist executive into law, disregarding the pattern of life underlying the Constitution. An innovation repugnant to the spirit of the Constitution may be palmed off as land reform. But amendments notwithstanding, there is a spirit underlying the Constitution which cannot be obliterated or ignored.

The Russian communists have already notified for the benefit of the communists in India that what the Indian National Congress is doing is State socialism and not the true socialism of the communists. They have furnished to the Indian communists this new slogan to maintain the integrity of their party. It may be prophesied that the Indian National Congress will, in accordance with its latter day tendency and technique, follow up by adopting this slogan in competition with the communists. The Russian communists have declared that, unless the institution of property is destroyed and the State becomes the only producer, there can be no true socialism. This is what we may assume to be the final point to which the road that is proposed to be taken will take the nation through injustice and coercion.

May 21, 1960 *Swarajya*

INTERNATIONAL SPYING

President Eisenhower said at the airport when he arrived in Paris for the Summit conference : "The hopes of humanity call on the four of us to purge our minds of prejudice and our hearts, of rancour". All good men and women will devoutly cry 'Amen' to this great appeal of the American President.

The prompt and candid admission of the American Government effectually wrote off the disgrace that for a moment enveloped America over the shooting down of an American investigation plane flying over Russian territory. Straight-forward action is always the best policy. But, unfortunately, later some attempts were made to revise, so to say, this policy and to prove that there was something fishy in the Russian claim of having shot down this plane. These later attempts may hurt the Summit prospects, not the original incident neutralized by the frank admission of the U.S. President.

It is well known that spying is an old and recognized international procedure. Like other things, spying has improved with improved techniques. There is nothing terribly surprising therefore in an attempt to fly over 'enemy' territory to take records. The claim that it is aggression to fly over national air space would apply to open and public trespass. The morality of spying by-passes this objection.

The law of exclusive control of the space above national territory has been rudely set aside in the very idea of intercontinental ballistic missiles. The missiles are planned to shoot over neutral air spaces, which would be flagrant and deliberate violation of that law. Indeed, it seems as if that part of international law has been quietly repealed by scientific advance in space travel.

The outstanding point is that in the present era of thermo-nuclear bombs the exercise of the traditional military art of adventurous spying is an extremely dangerous game. A single soldier-spy, in the old days, could spy but he was no danger beyond that. Whereas, today, even a single plane flying without notice can carry death for the whole of a city and the district around. When the spying is to be done by planes flying at great heights, when every one is obsessed with fear of nuclear destruction, it is likely to rouse fear and inflame passions, so that it should be entirely ruled out. What has so far come out of this U-2 incident convincingly demonstrates the positive danger of decentralized nuclear power. With numerous weak points scattered all over the world, at any one of which an error can start a disastrous conflagration, all plans of spying from space must be abrogated unilaterally as something that dangerously adds to international tension.

On the whole this incident, instead of being just one more feather in Mr. Khrushchov's cap or an impediment to the Summit, may turn out in fact to be an additional incentive for acceptance of an open part of the scheme of disarmament. It would be far safer and better for all concerned than spying. Its romantic attractions are out of place in a world which has entered the thermo-nuclear era.

May 21, 1960 *Swarajya*

THE WAY OUT FROM PARIS

THE world is now in peril, for the rulers of men have thrown away old values and replaced civilization by competitive technology and recklessness. The masses, men and women, have been completely hypnotized into total dependence on those that govern. We are at one of those terrible moments for which

the god of war hungrily awaits. Something may spark the nuclear magazines that lie ready on both sides to extinguish the world, and teach mankind to be humble once again. Anger, hatred and injured pride are rocking America into violent hysteria. On the other side, in Russia, this violence is balanced by scorn and calculated readiness for all eventualities.

It is on occasions like this that man turns to prayer. May the wise men among us be inspired with the courage required to hold men's passions back and to lead them in the way of sanity.

I am one of the many admirers of Mr. Khrushchov, who feel rather sad now. Proportion is of the very essence of reasonableness. The qualities that deservedly brought great dividends for this most outstanding statesman have unfortunately taken him to limits where they must begin to give diminishing returns.

It is deplorable that at Paris Mr. Khrushchov made the great issues of disarmament and abrogation of nuclear armaments depend on a verbal performance on the part of President Eisenhower, which was superfluous—an apology for an incident which had already brought more than abundant public embarassment to the U.S. President. Mr. Khrushchov had worked hard for this great meeting at Paris. Humanity had hoped a great deal from it. But it broke up in a rather silly manner.

That Mr. Khrushchov had grave cause for indignation over the U-2 affair is beyond question. It is plain enough that the U.S. Government sadly bungled. But Mr. Khrushchov should have been content with the public discomfiture of Mr. Eisenhower. It was as good as an apology that, in that climate, he was there to meet Mr. Khrushchov at the Summit. The interests of peace should have prevailed over the much less serious affair of good manners over a spying incident, during the cold war, to terminate which with all its ugly concommitants was the very object of the Summit Conference. The procedure of a personal affair of honour had no application to the business on hand at the conference.

If as a result of the conference a scheme of open inspection were agreed upon as an essential part of the treaty, the U-2 affair would have been thereafter only an interesting event which brought a windfall to Russia and great discomfiture to an America of the past. The incident could have itself served most effectively to bring all parties to mutual agreement over open inspection; whereas now it has ended up in distorting Mr. Khrushchov's figure and making him appear as an angry man unable to control himself even when the issues at stake called for utmost equanimity and calm endeavour. The U-2 incident had lifted Russia up, but the Paris incident has caused a bad drop again.

Mr. Khrushchov's error on this great occasion is unpardonable but he can still retrieve the position. He has remarkable ability as well as a sincere desire to bring the deadly race in modern armaments to a halt. His emotional make-up has great potentiality, both for hostile exhibition and for brave friendliness. That Mr. Khrushchov did not precipitate an East German treaty is an indication that he quickly realized he had gone too far in Paris, and that he still seeks peace and does not wish to intensify the cold war. It seems idle to attempt finding sinister origins for this good sign that proves that a genuine desire for settlement still guides Mr. Khrushchov's policies.

If Mr. Khrushchov could summon up courage and apologise, as he ought to, for his loss of self-control at Paris, the whole situation would change at once. The spy-plane incident would recede in importance behind this greatness of conduct. Mutual apologies have great potential energy. They not only restore goodwill. They bring about a fresh tide of positive goodwill over which the ship of peace may sail and be successfully launched. But miracles are in the hands of God and occur only if He wills. Putting aside this possible miracle, let us appraise the situation now.

Mr. Eisenhower is disgusted with Mr. Khrushchov and Mr. Khrushchov equally abhors meeting Mr. Eisenhower. It is not likely that these two will meet again even for the great cause of

saving the world from destruction. Each waits for a successor known or unknown to take the place of the other. But this also is not possible in the near future.

A failure is not just a failure. Often it leaves behind a fresh addition to existing difficulties. The break-up of the Paris meeting has added considerably to the impediments to peace and goodwill. The way in which Mr. Khrushchov made it impossible for the conference to be proceeded with in spite of herculean attempts to patch up the quarrel, makes any fresh attempt for a Summit Conference extremely difficult. We do not wish to believe it has been made impossible. The interests involved are so great that nothing should be taken as having made it impossible. But it is very near to it.

Although attempts to solve things by personal diplomacy are no longer available, there is an impersonal forum for peace in the United Nations. China should be invited to become a member, and world peace and the proposal to abrogate nuclear armaments should be taken up for negotiation in this enlarged forum. Personal loss of confidence, however justified, may be treated as irrelevant and discussion kept in the U.N. at an impersonal and dry level.

There is grim humour in the threat that tests may be resumed by both the U.S. and the U.S.S.R. If the flight of a spy-plane over national air space is a horrible infringement of international good behaviour, what about large scale poisoning of the whole world's atmosphere irrespective of national air space? The resumption of tests must be treated as something beyond the range of permissibility. With this good start, the invitation to China to join, and a declaration against all test explosions, the U.N. must take up all that was on the Paris agenda and proceed with it, and all may yet be well. When personal diplomacy has crumbled as a result of rudeness, humdrum methods may prove really useful.

May 28, 1960 *Swarajya*

THE RUSSIAN PROPOSALS

Mr. Khrushchov's comprehensive proposals for ending the cold war have been published. It is suspected by American diplomatic opinion to have been prepared before and for the purpose of the Summit Conference at Paris. If this be true, it is indeed a pity that the conference was not allowed to meet and discuss the eminently reasonable and realistic scheme but dispersed after an angry scene over an incident which had no relevancy to the issues before the Summit meeting, except as an additional example demonstrating the need for an agreed scheme to end mutual suspicions.

The atmosphere has been greatly fouled for good understanding or for any reasonable approach, however good any scheme put forward may be. There can be no doubt, in an outside observer's mind, as to the highly reasonable, realistic and just proposals embodied in the Russian proposal now presented to the public. But there is not a single American Democratic or Republican politician or official who will look at it as it should be viewed and examined. There is far too much anger and resentment in the American air to allow such calm consideration. Much the best way to deal with it would be to refer it to the Harvard University men who brought out the great book, *World Peace through World Law,* for an academic examination and impartial comment. The prevailing atmosphere may have infected Harvard too, but it is the best place we can find for the much needed examination of the scheme. It is a forlorn hope that it is possible to have another Summit meet for tackling the problem. As an Indian caricaturist has very truly and beautifully presented it, the situation now is the Prodigal World returning home to the U.N. The problem of world peace must be tackled in its legitimate forum, viz., the United Nations, and for this purpose an examination of the Russian scheme by Grenville Clark and Louis B. Sohn with such assistance as they may

need from the U.S. Government would be the best thing that can now be done with it. We had placed great hopes on the personal diplomacy of Mr. Eisenhower and Mr. Khrushchov but those hopes having ended in nothing, the Russian scheme now published offers a good start for the U.N. to take the matter up. Let us hope that it will not be dismissed out of hand by anger and suspicion.

June 11, 1960 *Swarajya*

PLANNING AGRICULTURAL CHAOS

THE inherent contradictions and basic errors in congressmen's policies occasionally get revealed by their own statements. Mr. B. D. Jatti, Chief Minister of Mysore, has done some hard thinking and he has come to two conclusions, one, that the problem in our agricultural economy is the smallness of the holdings, and two, that co-operative farming is, therefore, the only solution for our land problems. If the malady to be tackled is the small size of the farms in our country, we must first see what has led to this through the ages, before we proceed to discover and apply a remedy.

The absence of industries in the rural area which could absorb the growing numbers in the families devoted to agriculture, and the laws of inheritance relating to real property, have led to this problem. It should be obvious then that it was wholly wrong to give way to the demand for further multiplying the shares of landed property by giving equal rights to daughters and sons. The problem of our girls is marriage and not property. By the law conferring inheritance right on daughters, the fragmentation is doubled at one stroke. Before any solution was found for the evil of uneconomic holdings the reformers have doubled the mischief.

Again, instead of encouraging and devising measures for bringing about voluntary transfers of small holdings, so that economic farms may take the place of uneconomic ones wherever they exist, the trends of land policies have resulted in a general unwillingness to buy any farm land. Uncertainty is the worst enemy of enterprise. People are not willing to increase the size of their holding, lest they fall into the net of ceiling laws some day and lose the money invested in such ventures. People naturally feel that it is safer to bear with present evils than stake good money on an uncertain future. One result of the uncertainty of land laws is that bank deposits have increased.

Next let us consider the land ceiling idea from another angle. If in the vast Indian desert of small and allegedly uneconomic holdings, we have a few oases of large holdings, is it good policy to strike even these down or chop them up ? Assuming that we decide upon a reasonable ceiling, how long can it last ? The next partition in the family will make it a tenth of what is now declared as permissible ceiling. The holdings will in a very few years dwindle in size with accelerated speed and all the oases converted into desert sand. Removal of inequality with a vengeance, and instead of solving the problem of holdings, multiplying the problem !

In considering the question from the purely agro-economic point of view, we should not bring into the argument likes and dislikes, or a consideration of the persons involved. The problem must be looked at only from the agro-economic angle. All holdings will get rapidly diminished in size and soon there will not even be the exceptions to the prevailing uneconomical size of holdings. If we are not able to find a solution, or if we are not able to put into execution a solution that may overcome the malaise, is it good policy to add to and increase the problem by breaking up even the farms that are now large enough ? Is it not just passion devoid of wisdom ? Is it good to anticipate the work of family expansion and the inevitable breaking up of landed property through the effect of inheritance laws, and

produce at once by law what is bound to come fifteen years hence as a result of sharing?

What Mr. Jatti has envisaged must make us think even harder than hitherto. The inevitable conclusion will be that Congress policies must lead to compulsory collectivization, which means transfer of good land under good and diligent peasant ownership to State or quasi-State management with its corollary of indifferent attention and uninterested management. The peasantry will become wage-earners, with the inevitable discontent issuing out of wage earning status, work without owners' interest and all the evils associated with industrial labour.

The only right solution for making uneconomic holdings into larger ones is a conservative plan of encouragement of voluntary sales and mergers; and this encouragement can issue only when certainty replaces uncertainty in land values and with the opening up of countrywide small industries in order to absorb and reduce the pressure on land.

The land ceiling laws and other laws which treat owners harshly and look upon them as an anti-social section of the people accelerate the process of deterioration of land values and discourage buying and merging. The final result will be agricultural chaos. Nothing better could be planned, if we wanted an acceleration of the pace of communism.

June 11, 1960 *Swarajya*

STATE COMPULSION DOOMED TO FAIL

HUMANITY in its march forward in civilization came to two great institutions, Property and Religion. They came to be, not as a result of propaganda but out of universal experience of countless years. If we wish to foster human initiative and enterprise,

we must protect the rights of property. If we want to restrain human appetites and produce order and co-operation among men, we must have religion.

No amount of external direction can replace the magic of property. No amount of State compulsion can replace religion. Indeed, the very source of energy for external direction or for State action will dry up if we tamper with the institution of property or withdraw protection from it, or if we kill faith and the spirit of religion. Not external law but only the powerful sanction of fear of sin, and hope and love generated by religion can effectively keep in check the excesses of human appetites. Without religion the attempt to create welfare, out of State compulsion, is doomed to abject failure. This vain attempt can be boosted only by distorting the very meaning of 'welfare' and 'progress'. Progress must mean only advance towards a desirable and laudable goal. The extinction of human dignity and individual freedom in order to 'progress', vitiates the nature of progress itself. Progress achieved by losing self-direction (*swatantra*) and giving more and more, and finally all direction to the State, is not progress. "Know what you are changing before you start to change it," said Ritchie Calder of UNESCO expanding the old maxim of the great French physiologist Claude Bernard—"In knowledge pursue, but in ignorance refrain." The article in our Constitution which laid down that all citizens in India shall have the right to acquire, hold and dispose of property and practise any profession or carry on any occupation, trade or business was not framed to be unwisely mauled, disobeyed and discredited within ten years of our freedom.

The checks needed against the misuse of the right to hold property must be moral checks issuing out of religion, not in a denial of the right itself. To do all in our power to weaken the universal mechanism of restraint and social solidarity, viz., religion, and to seek to create a new mechanism through recently enacted laws are bound to be a dismal failure. The very process of dissent and debate through which a law must go before

it is finalised weakens its potency and makes it a poor substitute for religion that has achieved universal acceptance and confirmation through common practice without dissent or debate. Statesmanship demands the conservation of helpful forces of such great potency. It is a poor intelligence that would seek to throw them away in favour of an inadequate substitute.

To the superficial eye the various penal laws may appear to be responsible for human good conduct. But a little reflection would show that what brought about the laws as well as what continues to maintain good conduct is the conscience and good sense inside us, fostered and maintained by religion. Most people abstain from lying, cheating, stealing and murder not on account of the law but on account of the sense of what is *dharma.* The punishment for the breach depends on laws, but the sanction for good conduct is not in the law but in what produced the law, viz., the inner sense nursed by religious faith and practice.

Self-government essentially means self-reliance, self-restraint, self-discipline, self-denial, self-direction as contrasted with a system of government which places unlimited power in the State and its officials, to restrain, control and direct and hence compulsorily to enslave and regiment the individual.

Apart from, and in addition to, all other causes, the proclaimed atheism of communist Powers lies at the bottom of the distrust of nations making negotiations and treaties with them difficult. It is not religionism, but distrust, which naturally arises out of the absence of even an argument why they should not break their word when it would suit them. It is most unfortunate for the world that co-existence and peace are rendered difficult on account of the declared atheism of the communist Powers. May India never consciously or unknowingly get into this evil condition, as it can easily, if it goes on flirting with communist policies and secularism in increasing measure.

June 18, 1960 . *Swarajya*

A TREATY TO END NUCLEAR TESTS

THE Chinese operations against India and her neighbouring territories have for the time being turned national attention to the dangers of communist aggression in Asia, and people talk of the cold war having been transferred to Asia. Still the main danger to humanity as a whole lies in the nuclear arms race and the deadly wepons stored in the U.S. and U.S.S.R.

A treaty over the tests that is nearing completion in Geneva is of the greatest consequence to the whole world. The following extracts from what two eminent men have said (very recently) will be read with satisfaction all over the world. Mr. Chester Bowles, our one time American Ambassador and a powerful member of the Democratic Party of America, writes in an article in a recent issue of *The New Leader* :

> The latest Soviet proposal and the Eisenhower-Macmillan counter-proposal have now brought within striking distance the possibility for a Summit agreement on a nuclear test ban. Seventeen articles out of a proposed 22-article treaty have been agreed upon. In principle, the U S.S R. has committed itself to accept a complex global monitoring and control system that will include foreign observers and inspectors operating inside Russia.
>
> A treaty based on these propositions would be a tremendous step forward, even if it did not cover the presently undetectable small bomb tests conducted underground. It would set into motion the world's first trial international inspection system. It would initiate the process of international controls for which we have waited so long, and upon which the chances for all further progress directly depend.

About the five articles which remain to be agreed upon at the Geneva Conference, Mr. Bertrand Russell writes :

I consider the remaining differences trivial and I am persuaded that, if either the Western or the Soviet negotiators had any real wish to reach agreement, a treaty could very quickly be concluded.

Mr. Russell says further :

Communists and anti-communists can live together or die together, or, just possibly, arrive at the superiority of one of the two groups. For my part, I wish to see them live together, and I wish most earnestly to see them not *die* together. If this worst possibility is to be prevented, it is not enough for each side to bristle with H-bombs ready to be fired off whenever a flight of starlings is mistaken for enemy missiles. It is necessary that each side should learn to treat the other with common courtesy and with the realization that we all live in glass houses. The calm assumption that of course the other side would cheat, but of course our side would not, is made by both sides. But to hear some champions of the West speaking, one would never guess that the other side can be equally sincere in its suspicions. Let it be granted that there are risks ; but once this has been granted, it should be admitted that our present course involves a far greater probability of far worse disasters than any that are to be feared from more conciliatory policies.

The following from a letter in *The New York Times* of May 30 written by Mr. Erich Kahler may also be read with considerable interest :

The people of the world are beginning to revolt against the gamble of the Big Two. They are more interested in their survival and their protection from fall-out than in the outcome of the struggle between capitalism and communism. All the more so since they are made to realize by events in Korea, Turkey, Vietnam and South Africa how 'free' the free world actually is.

Both Russia and America have failed their global responsibility : Russia on the spot of the Summit, America long before. Khrushchov has disappointed the world by his lack of restraint and his impossible demands. The Eisenhower Administration has

jeopardised the reputation of America as a peace-loving nation by never taking the Summit conference and the current negotiations quite seriously.

This is evidenced by the attitude of the Administration all along; the U-2 incident was just one link in a long line of careless or clearly unresponsive acts. Among the many instances that could be mentioned, recent ones include the tendency to ignore or minimize any Russian concession, the announcement of the President that he wanted to leave the Summit conference after a week, the lack of any serious preparation for the disarmament discussion, the 'alert' on the eve of the conference—perhaps the most irresponsible act of all.

The danger of a surprise attack was declared non-existent by a report of the Army itself on May 4 (*The New York Times*, May 5). It could not be used as an excuse for either the 'alert' or for that matter the reconnaissance flight of the U-2 just before the Summit conference.

If Mr. Erich Kahler of Princeton could write in this strain, it is no wonder Mr. Khrushchov thought that they had sought to fool him and so completely lost his temper.

Any way, to use the editorial language of *The New York Times*, "the leaders of the Big Two during the last week of May struck postures of moderation which dispelled much of the anxiety generated by the Summit fiasco". Now that there is less tension, summitry being out, we must go back to classical diplomacy and the U.N. The Big Two should remember the responsibility they carry towards the peoples of the world and not only towards their own peoples. The rest of the world, and in particular the 'uninvolved' nations, should also remember their own duties and realize their own souls and not get too accustomed to the mentality of drift.

June 18, 1960 *Swarajya*

WORK AS WORSHIP

We must find a solution for the problems of economic progress in India which will steer clear of the physical compulsions adopted with 'success' in China and of the plan of expense and foreign loans leading to bankruptcy adopted at present by the Government of India. What is needed is a spiritual drive for hard physical labour as a matter of religious duty, which will convert man-power into gold. The *Gita* gives us the clue. All work is equally noble and is worship in itself if done in a spirit of dedication. This is the *Gita* teaching.

This was the sanction for work in the old days. The division of all work into caste functions was based on this polity. There were not only four castes as the simplified scriptures might lead us to believe, but a hundred castes even in those days, each one of which had a social function allotted to it as religious duty. There was no room for ambitions or frustrations consequent on failure of such ambitions. To-day, for several causes, that system has all but broken down.

We need a spiritual force that can be a substitute for the physical compulsions that in totalitarian countries produce the labour needed for progress. In the absence of this, our man-power is going to waste. If we could provide a non-compulsory but effective sanction, we could convert our man-power into wealth and achievement. A mere appeal for hard work cannot be mistaken for a force or a sanction. If the appeal comes from a personality of eminence or holy influence, it may carry to some extent the force of a duty. But our Prime Minister's appeal is not intensive or single-pointed. It loses much of its inherent strength by what he otherwise speaks or does.

The rigidity of the old caste system, and the idea of superiority and inferiority that came to be associated with it, do not

permit any going back to it in the present times. But the sacredness and equality in social and national value of all work enunciated in the *Gita* is something that we can derive out of that system and apply even in our changed world.

We must revive and reinforce the *Gita* doctrine of all work being equally noble and being dedicated as worship. We must revive the simple life which would enable the national exchequer as well as private capital to pay more or less equally for all honest 'work of all kinds' to which each one of us is fit, or can be easily adapted. The *Gita* way of life and the *Gita* doctrine of equal worth of all tasks are the only alternatives to the physical compulsions of godless totalitarianism. That doctrine is of permanent relevancy even though the caste polity is no longer there. As long as there are functions and social values, the *Gita* doctrine is available for application.

Free work to fullest capacity, free in the sense of freedom from external compulsion is the alternative to the way of communism as practised by China and Russia. Where machinery is scarce and poverty limits the use of imported time-saving implements, we must use our man-power to the fullest extent. It is stupid to cry for reduction of population without being sure of the means of progress or of the success of our plans. The human body is a most wonderful and powerful tool by itself and need not be undervalued and neglected.

The urge to work cannot arise or be expected to come out of a mere appeal from above. It must issue from an inner conviction and spiritual hunger in each one of us. And this can only be created by religion. If we reflect on this, we shall see how great and valuable the *Gita* is. That precious and holy inheritance has not been put to purposeful use. We have in the *Gita* a real Plan for the realization of India's ambitions. We must link our efforts, our aims as well as the means, with the *Gita*, which is universal in outlook. Either that or physical compulsion, these are the only two alternatives. The psychological change that

Mr. Jayaprakash Narayan and Vinobaji desire can only come from a religious conversion of the highest and purest type, for which we must work.

The Five Year Plan with the scramble for the biggest share in it, along with an unwillingness and incapacity to bear the burden of taxation that goes with it, is no good and should be substituted by the *Gita* and a plan based on universal labour that was taught by the *Gita-Acharya* as the nation-wide form of worship of God as well as the means of welfare in the worldly sense.

June 18, 1960 *Swarajya*

AGREEMENT ON NUCLEAR WEAPONS

The nearer we are to an agreement which would terminate the condition of fear and wasteful expenditure on deterrence and defence against possible enemy action, the more assiduous certain elements become in devising new fears and suspicions to prevent such a termination.

A point was made by France—and it was made to appear very big—that in the last scheme put forward by Russia, inasmuch as disarmament measures were given first place above control plans, it would enable one side or the other (the suggestion was of course that Russia would do it) to deceive the world and conceal their own armaments, while the opposite party would honestly fulfil the terms of the treaty and become a helpless victim. The French delegate, M. Jules Moch, asked whether Russia would agree that the treaty may provide for simultaneous and effective measures for disarmament as well as for control, and that inspection teams should have power to verify the destruction of weapons and to look for hidden stockpiles. The Russian delegate at once replied affirmatively and declared that his Gov-

ernment would agree to this simultaneous process of disarmament and control measures. There is nothing now to prevent a diligent drive towards complete understanding. But humanity's misfortune may bring up some totally unacceptable new points of suspicion.

The fundamental evil is that whatever Russia agrees to, there remains in the Western mind a permanent fear of being deceived, and agreement is put off. As I have often said, the mischief arises out of the declared a-moral creed of the communists. It was an unlucky day for the world the communists gave up God who linked men together. We must all—the uninvolved peoples of the world specially—pray for a spirit of mutual trust to replace this unfortunate frame of mind. The cause at our heart is not the strengthening or weakening of one side or the other but saving mankind from destruction, to the brink of which two Great Powers have taken the world in their pride of technological advance and their mutual fears.

While statesmen work for peace at Geneva or elsewhere, and appear almost to have reached agreement, there are certain groups, may be, actuated by the vested interests created by the large nuclear war industry, whose honest but suspicious minds work in the opposite direction. It seems as if this treaty over nuclear armaments is almost as difficult as war itself and the chances of success as uncertain in the one case as in the other. All this has been brought about by a fatal chain of causes and effects dating from nuclear research. While a treaty to do away with nuclear weapons is in progress, attempts are being made in the direction of a greater distribution of points of vulnerability, error and accident, almost as if to invite disaster even before the climax is reached in its due course. No more dangerous policy can be conceived of than this so-called nuclear plan of widespread vigilance.

It was an unfortunate day when science lifted the curtain of fundamental matter and trespassed into the greenroom of crea-

tion. It seems as if outraged Nature is having her revenge. Knowledge must go into penitence and humble condition and forgiveness.

June 25, 1960 *Swarajya*

ACCEPT RUSSIAN PROPOSALS

We were never in history so near to a happy consummation, yet we have, more than ever before, hatred and suspicion hovering over the good signs. Whatever be the mystery of Russian good conduct, let us not lose the chance that has now come almost like a miracle for world peace. Let us forget Paris and forge disarmament and push the cause of peace forward by saying 'Yes' to the Russian proposals. There is plenty of work to be done yet to make the peace abiding, but here is the first step that has to be saved from being lost. Pride and Fear, Narrow-mindedness, Stupidity, and Despair must all be put aside ruthlessly—for these are greater enemies than those whom we call enemies.

Brinkmanship we have had enough. No more varieties of it, for Heaven's sake ! Let us do some thinking and follow reason.

Here is a Power, with strength demonstrated, great strength without doubt, greater than the strength of anyone else according to all obvious estimates, offering terms for lasting peace, in which the cleverest and most suspicious cannot find any flaw. Let us not be afraid of peace, because we have been too long in the cold war and got used to it. Do not harp on the possibility of treachery. Human fellowship would be impossible on the basis of an incorrigible Pearl Harbour complex. Let us be careful, but let us not be impossible. Against Pearl Harbour, the story of Hiroshima and Nagasaki is an unforgettable memory. Let the one cancel

out the other and let us put our signatures on the Russian proposals. There is no need and no room for the invention of alternate proposals. Let us give the prize to Russia for originality, if with that concession we can secure peace and save the shameless waste of resources on armaments that cost their weight in gold and which should never be used, and which a hungry world is waiting for use otherwise in a hundred ways, to make this planet happy.

Let the proposals be examined by people who have spent many decades over the problem of World Peace and World Law. Let us ask them to improve and fill them up properly. Do not be frightened by the fears of the professional warriors.

July 2, 1960 *Swarajya*